

UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

DEC 1955

SOCIAL SCIENCE
LIBRARY

THE AMERICAN I M A G O

VOL. 12

WINTER
1955

NO. 4

*A Psychoanalytic Journal
for the Arts and Sciences*

BF

173

A2

A33

COPYRIGHT BY
AMERICAN IMAGO 1955

Founded by: Hanns Sachs, Boston

Publisher and Managing Editor: George B. Wilbur, M. D.

THE AMERICAN I M A G O

VOL. 12

WINTER
1955

NO. 4

*A Psychoanalytic Journal
for the Arts and Sciences*

COPYRIGHT BY
AMERICAN IMAGO 1955

Founded by: Hanns Sachs, Boston
Publisher and Managing Editor: George B. Wilbur, M. D.

PRINTED AT THE REGISTER PRESS
YARMOUTH PORT, MASSACHUSETTS

The Neurotic Hero of Typee

by

Helen B. Petrullo

The riddle of human development, long the province of analytical psychological studies, has been for a longer time still the concern of the artist. Presumably today's artist can, by making use of scientific psychological knowledge, easily symbolize the conflicts and tensions in personalities. This does not mean, however, that pre-Freudian artists erred in their use of symbols in describing psychological states. On the contrary, as is well known, Freud formulated many of his early hypotheses on the basis of material contained in literary works. What it does mean is that today's writer is perhaps more deliberate in his use of symbols and it is interesting, therefore, to examine a pre-Freudian literary work which is a neat, but unconscious, symbolic representation of a psychological process.

Herman Melville's first novel, *Typee*, published in 1845, belongs to the great stream of 19th century romanticism which had turned inward to conduct researches into the self. As Lionel Trilling has pointed out in *The Liberal Imagination*, Freud and the Romantics shared a common ground in their "perception of the hidden element of human nature and of the opposition between the hidden and the visible." (1) Once the main thread of the story in *Typee* is extracted from the mass of physical and social descriptions and from the diatribes hurled at civilization, the opposition between the "hidden" and the "visible" becomes quite clear.

D. H. Lawrence has described *Typee* as a sort of "birth-myth" and, also, as something of the Oedipus myth. Actually it is both, for basically they are the same thing, as Otto Rank has shown. Behind the Oedipus saga, Rank

1. Lionel Trilling, *The Liberal Imagination* (Garden City, 1954), p. 45.

says, "stands the mysterious question of the origin and destiny of man, which Oedipus desired to solve, not intellectually, but by actually returning into the mother's womb."

(2)

The hero of *Typee* is also concerned with the origin and destiny of man and, before escaping from his ship, wonders if the savages of the Marquesas may not be happier than the civilized man with his thousand wants and cares. Constantly posed is the question of the meaning of civilization but the escape into the luxuriant, closed valley of Typee is hardly an intellectual solution.

It is rather the answer of the neurotic. The term *neurotic* as used here follows Rank's definition:

The neurotic, generally speaking, as analysis has proved, fails in sexuality; which in this connection is as good as saying that he is not content with the gratification of partially returning to the mother, afforded in the sexual act and in the child, but has remained fixedly "infantile" and even still desires to go **completely** or as a whole back into the mother. Finally, he is incapable of settling the birth trauma in the normal way by preventing anxiety through sexual gratification, and is thrown back to the primal form of libido gratification which remains unattainable and against which his adult Ego strives by developing anxiety. (3)

Rank goes further, distinguishing between the neurotic who must produce his striving over and over again on his own body and the artist who can objectify the striving and throw it outside himself. Melville has unmistakably objectified in art form the agonies of the neurotic.

The hero of *Typee* comes to grief with Reality; as explicitly stated, life aboard the "Dolly" becomes unbearable and he decides to abandon ship at the first opportunity. Determined to escape, he gathers all the information he can about the island and its inhabitants. The topographical descriptions of the island into which he desires to escape can be considered as the symbols of a wish-dream, and, accord-

2. Otto Rank, *The Trauma of Birth* (New York, 1952), p. 43.

3. Rank, p. 48.

ing to Freud, all symbols in such a dream represent abode in the womb, the primal situation.

The wished-for destination of the hero is unmistakable. "The bay of Nukuheva in which we were lying is an expanse of water not unlike in figure . . . a horseshoe. . . . It is, perhaps, nine miles in circumference. You approach it from sea by a narrow entrance, flanked on either side by two small twin islets which soar conically to the height of some five hundred feet.

" . . . It presented the appearance of a vast natural amphitheatre in decay, and overgrown with vines, the deep glens that furrowed its sides appearing like enormous fissures caused by the ravages of time." (4)

With Paradise seemingly so near at hand the hero makes scanty preparations for his journey. He does, however, provide himself with a companion. Well it is he has a companion, for there is no food to be found on the mountain ridges to which they escape and travel is tortuous and dangerous. Moreover, on the third day, the hero is stricken with chills and fever, and a swollen leg. At about the same time, however, the hero discovers a valley lying below them. Looking into the "bosom" of the valley, with its verdure and its palmetto-thatched huts, he immediately compares it to the gardens of paradise. Toby, his companion, wants to proceed to the valley at once, no matter whether it is inhabited by the cannibal tribe, Typee, or by the friendly tribe, Happar. Their situation, he feels, is too desperate to admit a choice. The hero, on the other hand, hesitates because they have no way of knowing who inhabits the valley. He is apprehensive. He wants to find instead a "capacious and untenanted valley, abounding with all manner of delicious fruit." The hero wants to rest. He has an injured leg.

Rank traces hysterical paralysis to the anxiety produced by the birth trauma and he states "the inhibited function

4. Herman Melville, *Typee*, *Selected Writings of Herman Melville* (New York, 1952), pp. 491-492.

of walking or moving is nothing other than the physically materialized agoraphobia, while the immobility brings to realization at the same time the pleasurable primal situation, with the dread or horror of being freed therefrom." (5)

In his essay on *Typee*, Lawrence said that Melville wanted the death of life, but in striving for death he became physically sick. (6) Similarly the hero's sickness operates as a barrier to his regression, while at the same time, as the story repeats over and over again, it prevents his terminating the regression. This situation is what Rank calls "the 'primal ambivalence' of the psychical." It derives from "the double barriers of repression": the prevention of the memory of the primal pleasure through the birth anxiety, and the forgetting of the painful birth trauma by remembering the previous pleasure experience. (7)

No wonder man's existence is so thoroughly complicated and painful. This "primal ambivalence of the psychical" explains the hero's alternating sympathy between the life of the *Typee* and toward his home civilization, toward the savage and toward civilized man. It explains too his sudden shift of attitude on arriving in the valley where, after having been prodded by Toby into making the descent, at one stage by long roots which could be construed as symbols of the unbiblical cord and as such a symbolic means of return into the intrauterine state, he refuses to try to effect an escape back to Nukuheva before making contact with the inhabitants of the valley. He still needs to rest. He has not yet begun to wonder about the significance of his wounded leg; attaining Paradise still seems possible.

Toby acts as a prod to the hero's weakened Ego, but, after being accepted by the "good" *Typee*, Toby manages to escape from the valley, ostensibly, to procure medical supplies and to find means for rescuing the disabled hero. Left

5. Rank, p. 48.

6. D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature* (New York, 1923), p. 203.

7. Rank, p. 199.

alone among the natives the hero alternates between periods of deep despair and periods of a kind of passive happiness. Prodding Toby is gone but the temporary enjoyments are soon poisoned by the hero's anxiety over the mysterious disease in his leg.

"It seemed as if I were destined to sink under this grievous affliction," the hero says, "or at least that it would hinder me from availing myself of any opportunity of escaping from the valley." (8)

As he drifts further and further into the native life, being fed by hand, carried on the back of the faithful Kory-Kory, bathed and anointed with oil by the pretty damsels, he falls into a state of apathy, and he begins to think that he is really in the "Happy Valley."

At the same time his leg suddenly heals. His mobility regained, the hero begins to wander about the valley, and in so doing passes beyond the domestic, household life which is all he has known so far. Gradually, as his improved health carries him farther and farther afield, he becomes aware of the great range of taboos that are an integral part of the Typee society.

The taboo becomes very important to the hero and to the development of the story. The hero believes that the taboos are based on the Typee theology; he never quite understands their real significance, that, in general, they are designed to separate male and female rites and functions. The Typee taboo system is administered by men, and in respect to such a cultural manifestation Rank says, "The development of the paternal domination into an increasingly powerful state system administered by men is thus a continuance of the primal repression, which has as its purpose the ever wider exclusion of woman—just on account of the painful memory of the birth trauma. . . ." (9)

In the kind of paradise the hero is seeking there is only one sex, the neuter. He succeeds in having the taboo against

8. Typee, p. 611.

9. Rank, p. 94.

women entering a canoe relaxed and he is afterwards able to recline in the stern of the canoe with the beautiful Faya-waye while the faithful Kory-Kory sweeps them along "beneath the shades of the overhanging thickets." The hero is permitted to indulge further his infantile emotions.

Soon after this development, Marnoo, a "taboo native," comes to the valley. Being "taboo" Marnoo is permitted to move freely between the island groups, and furthermore he is in touch with Nukuheva, the port. Marnoo is a reminder of the outside. That the hero's Ego is aroused is evident in his appeal to the taboo native to help him to escape and in his subsequent despondency when Marnoo leaves without him but it is not sufficiently aroused for him to take decisive action. He sinks again into apathy.

"Freed from apprehension [about my leg] and resolved to regard the future without flinching, I flung myself anew into all the social pleasures of the valley, and sought to bury all regrets, and all remembrances of my previous existence, in the wild enjoyments it afforded." (10)

Once more he ranges the valley, and on one sightseeing trip he encounters the tattoo artist, Karky, who tries desperately to tattoo him. The pain in his leg returns and with it comes increased desire to free himself from the valley. Richard Chase feels that the hero's revulsion against being tattooed stems from his fear of castration.

In speaking of the hero of *Typee*, Chase says,

With great effort and much suffering, he withdrew into the recesses of his own infantile sexuality and then escaped to a higher level. He feared cannibalism in general; but specifically he feared castration. This was the real content of the nameless foreboding which he felt when he descended into Typee Valley and when he was about to escape. He did not feel this fear during the time when he was able to give himself over to the mild eroticism of the valley. . . This figure, the hero suffering the fear of castration, became a common one in Melville. (11)

10. *Typee*, p. 645.

11. Richard Chase, *Herman Melville* (New York, 1949), p. 12.

If Chase is using "the fear of castration" as Rank does, that is, as deriving from the act of birth, we agree with him. Rank says, "... the importance of the castration fear is based ... on the primal castration at birth, that is on the separation of the child from the mother." (12)

For the hero the matter of tattooing is crucial for it means being initiated into the man world of the Typee, and, if he submits, the kind of child life he has been indulging in will come to an end; on the reverse side of that coin is the commitment to become a native.

At last his ego is really aroused. Wandering through the groves away from the women he becomes critical and active. He finds the Typee sunk in religious sloth. The penalty of the Fall presses too lightly on them. His intellect begins to function for the first time since entering the valley.

As much as he dislikes civilization, he is a civilized man and he cannot accept a savage state of manhood. His regressive attempt has approached too near the sought for Paradise and in so doing it has violently clashed with the primal anxiety, "which keeps watch in front of Paradise, like the Cherubim who holds the flashing sword before its gates." (13)

The hero makes a sudden escape when a whale boat from a ship needing crew enters the bay. With great effort he makes his way to the beach and boards the boat while the natives dispute among themselves as to whether or not he should go. His will is sufficiently aroused and, like an angry child who turns on its mother, he bashes the head of a Typee pursuer with a boat hook. In this way Melville's neurotic hero delivers himself from his attempted regression and again goes out into the symbolic space of the open seas.

12. Rank, p. 20.

13. Rank, p. 199.

The Tragic Guilt Of Prometheus

by

Helen Huckel

Whenever we come across an ever recurrent motif in myths and legends, we may be sure that we have found one of the eternal, unresolved or insoluble problems of mankind. One of these themes is the sacrifice or self-sacrifice of a demi-god or giant who was dismembered or dismembered himself voluntarily (1) to create the world out of himself. His bones then became rocks, his skull the sky, his hair grass, etc. He sacrificed his life so that the world could be.

According to Otto Rank in *Art and Artist* every creation is self-sacrifice. This holds true even for the violent sacrifice by identification of the victim with the priest. In artistic creation too the artist has to give up part of his life for his work. He has to sacrifice his individual life and comfort for his spiritual immortality. (2).

But Rank also sees another side to it. The hero does not sacrifice himself without reward. He gives up his life to gain a bigger one. His body becomes the universe itself. It is the age-old dream of mankind to expand, to grow into something bigger than one's self, to be ubiquitous and eternal.

The Greek hero, Prometheus, is not dismembered to form the world. But he sacrifices one part of his body for his creation, and this creation is mankind. Whichever version of the myth we take, and there are many of them, in one way or another he is responsible for the creature which today we recognize as human.

The myth and the evaluation of the personality of Prometheus change with the ideology of the epoch in which they were formed. One element stays invariable; he provides fire for mankind and is cruelly punished for it.

Everything else is fluctuating; Prometheus way of ac-

quiring the fire, its sources, and the character of Prometheus himself. He takes the fire from Zeus directly, or as Plato relates, from the god of the fire and volcanos, Hephaistos in Lemnos. Prometheus grasps it from Hephaistos' forge, from the sunwheel, or from the hearth of Zeus. He carries the flame in a hollow stalk of fennel, and at another time he uses a torch which he ignites with the sun. According to S. Reinach in *Aetos Prometheus* it was not Prometheus but an eagle who in prehistoric times brought the fire to mankind (3) from heaven to earth. We'll return to this as we proceed.

Some of the myths describe Prometheus as a god. In others he is a titan or demigod. Still others portray him as a human being. To Hesiod (4) he is a common cheat, to Aeschylus a noble martyr (5) who sacrifices himself for mankind. In one version man lived before Prometheus in animal-like darkness with no culture or goals. In another there was a heavenly peace and harmony on earth which Prometheus upset with his doubtful gift of fire; doubtful because it induced a new era in which man began to ponder about himself, his fate, and the where and why of the world. In some of the myths men possessed fire before Prometheus. Then Zeus took it away to punish and annihilate the human race. Prometheus took pity on mankind and brought the fire back to them.

Horace Properz and Ovid are responsible for the version in which Prometheus not only provided man with fire, but is his creator as well. This part was a later addition to the original myth; according to W. S. Fox in *Mythology of All Races* (6) it became generally accepted about 500 b.c. that Prometheus shaped man from clay in his own image.

In any case Prometheus is the creator of what we consider human kind. Whether Prometheus actually sculptured man and inspired him with life, or merely gave him a soul, it was he who lifted him out of beastly dullness and unawareness of himself into conscious existence.

With good reason Prometheus was looked upon as the first Greek artist. The artist creates the new out of himself

with the blood of his heart. He is concerned with the immortal part of human life, the spirit which will live long after the individual's physical death. This is true for Prometheus. His work of art is man.

He shaped him into a superior race, after his own, the demigods image, a race able to feel, to think, to plan, and before all, to love. He made him creative and inventive, he taught him to laugh and to cry, he gave him art, craft and culture. His race was meant to develop on and on, to dominate the world and tame nature as far as nature can ever be tamed.

Was this his crime? Was this the sin that provoked Zeus abysmal wrath to a degree that no torment, no humiliation seemed big enough for his vindication? And what, on the other hand, made the figure of Prometheus survive throughout the milleniums? What arouses our interest and deep sympathy for him even today? Perhaps there is a connection between these two questions. A myth or its hero that survive from generation to generation must have qualities which are still alive. His problems must be ours. There are always basic human needs and problems involved when a myth is formed, and its survival proves that they remain and are not tied down to any special epoch or nation. This fact made Oedipus immortal, it insures Prometheus' immortality as well.

The significance of fire was obvious to people at all times and in all cultures, from the Neanderthalman up to our Eastern and Western civilization. Long before man could come to logical conclusions, he instinctively felt that without fire he could not survive. Even the most primitive man searched for it, he tried to beat it out of stone, to find it by rubbing pieces of wood together. The discovery of fire was one of the great turning points in human history.

This vital interest in fire would justify and explain the stories, legends and myths built around it. But this would not suffice to keep these legends alive through the many thousand years. Whenever this happens, there is also a psychological factor involved. Such myths are packed with

symbolic meanings, amalgamating allegoric imagery with the deepest of human problems.

The myth of Prometheus concerns the age old struggle between father and son, the rivalry between the old and the young.

Prometheus, we said, gave man art and culture. He made him think beyond the limits of his own generation, and this implies plan and care for the coming one. This made him transgress his individual life, and thus gave him his unique immortality.

According to Bachelard in his *Psychanalyse du Feu* (7), Prometheus represents the childhood of mankind. Bachelard compares him to individual childhood as well. Fire is forbidden to the human child; the parent declares it taboo. The child mustn't play with matches. He is instructed to keep away from the stove. He is not to get too close to the fire place or touch the burning lamp. If he transgresses the parental prohibition he is rebuked or punished.

Prometheus, in taking the fire from the gods and putting it at the disposal of man, had intruded into a realm which was reserved for the gods—the fathers. No child should ever attempt what Prometheus dared, i.e. to touch what is meant for and compete with the father. No father tolerates an infraction of his rights, the challenge of his authority; and Zeus was the father of the fathers, the father of the gods! He solely had the privilege to create. He was the keeper of the sacred flame, the passion and the potency! He, who tries to do the same as Zeus makes himself the father's equal and robs him of his uniqueness.

This is why Prometheus was punished in an outrageous way. The monstrosity of the punishment is out of proportion, but its quality is in keeping with the quality of the crime. Prometheus transgressed his rights and was chained; he took his father's potency, and was castrated. Defenseless and impotent he had to endure what Zeus inflicted on him, the daily laceration of his liver which daily grew anew; a suited symbol of the penis alternating in erection and flaccidity. The liver was looked upon of old as the seat of

passion, thereby the fittest organ to provoke the father's jealousy.

The parrallel to a castration becomes all the more striking when we consider the aforementioned oldest, prehistoric version of the Prometheus myth where the figure of Prometheus was substituted by an eagle (3). This royal bird flew up to heaven, stole the fire, and brought it down to earth. The eagle in a fatherly position was the benefactor of mankind and its protector against evil. Thousands of years later, in classical times, Prometheus, the superman, followed the same roles. He was punished by the "fatherly" eagle's beak. The "royal bird" appears as an obvious father image, while the bird's bill acts as a wellknown penis symbol. Thus father's penis tears Prometheus liver to pieces.

To Freud in his *Acquisition of the Power over Fire* (8) Prometheus' carrying the fire in a hollow stalk of fennel which symbolizes the phallus, is an inversion of the facts, as it often occurs in dreams where thoughts are expressed by their opposites. Freud says that in the hollow stalk one carries water, not fire. He, who wants to possess himself of fire, must renounce the wish to extinguish it with water; the water of his urine. Freud reminds us of the story of Gulliver who extinguishes the fire of the Liliput queen's palace with the stream of his urine, a scene which clearly indicates the fire symbolizing passion, sexual intercourse, and lust.

Prometheus takes his father's fire, but he also quenches it. He checks his own, unlimited desire in favor of the benefit he wants to bestow upon mankind, cooling off his burning lust by the wisdom of his spiritual self, taming his passion by his cooler insight. His torture is the torture of civilized man who has to postpone the satisfaction of his primal instincts if he wants to sublimate them into culture, art, work, and love for mankind. Prometheus may be looked upon as the first super-ego.

Here again Prometheus interfered with the rights of the gods. It was their privilege to follow their instincts

however they desired, to satisfy their lusts wherever they wanted, to commit incest, adultery and violation if they chose. They were entitled to be despotic, arbitrary, cruel, and unjust. As Prometheus may represent the first super-ego, the gods could symbolize the uninhibited, unrestrained Id without any scrupulous morals. They were the masters, their own, and man's. Man was not supposed to participate in any of their privileged enjoyments or comforts.

And Prometheus, by teaching man the art of taming and utilizing the fire in a productive way—the art of sublimation—made him not only god's rival, but even represented a higher form of living. The son having surpassed the father, the demigod the god—what more serious crime could be transgressed on a proud, and tyranic master? It not only arouses ire, but fear as well. Regardless of Prometheus' various representations as rebel, noble martyr, or liberated sufferer, he must win out in the end. It is the course of the world that the young generation survives the old. No god, no father is able to castrate the son forever, and so the liver grows again, and Zeus' fears lurk behind his over-weening presumption. He is aware that Prometheus, the forethinker, has knowledge of the person predestined to overthrow Zeus. Zeus attempts to get hold of the secret by divers ways but still must accept Prometheus' refusal to reveal it. Zeus knows that Prometheus foresees the day when all of the father's efforts will be in vain, when he will no longer succeed in keeping the son's young, strong, ever rejuvenating force down, and when he will be forced to recognize his rival as his equal. He has no other outcome but reconciliation. Prometheus may be generous and forgiving. He is the victor!

A tremendous development may be traced from Prometheus, helplessly bound to the rocks to the Prometheus who strong and unbroken offers his hand in reconciliation. It is the development from childhood to adulthood. If we maintain that the gods represent the Id, that is the living out of unchecked drives according to the pleasure principle,

then Prometheus, a god, was free to live like them without restriction. He renounced voluntarily. He decided for growth toward adulthood. This made him heir to all the struggles and conflicts which a child undergoes who wants to liberate himself from the parental fetters and is unwillingly kept back by them. Prometheus bound is the child who fights to be free and remains a captive; Prometheus who forgives, is the man, grown to gigantic size by identification with the suffering mankind he redeems. Kereny. (9) compares Prometheus to Christ, the son of God, suffering the most painful fate of man.

But even if we understand the rage of Zeus, how can we understand why Prometheus, the savior of mankind, whose pure and altruistic intentions are above question, can knowingly accept a punishment which will incapacitate, castrate him for milleniums? Why, foreseeing the agony he will have to endure, does he provoke the rage of Zeus and refuse to be liberated by the intermediation of a third party which was offered repeatedly (for instance as in Aeschylus by Hermes)?

Does this strange phenomenon result from an inborn drive—Freud's primary masochism—which strives for discomfort and self-destruction? Or is it rather a reaction to his own aggression, a feeling of some guilt for which he has to atone, perhaps due to a development Reik describes in *Masochism in Modern Man* (10)? There Reik sums up the reversal pattern from sadism to masochism in three concise steps:

- 1) "As you do to me, so I do to you" (sadistic phase).
- 2) "As I do to you, so you do to me" (transition to masochism).
- 3) "As I do to me, so you do to me" (real masochism.)

According to Ehrenzweig (11) punishment may have as its main purpose a transformation of self-destructive wishes into external aggression. Prometheus' theft of the fire has the significance of castration, provoked by the display of an intact phallus. Ehrenzweig labels Prometheus' stealing oral aggression which is followed by oral castration.

Here we turn to the little boy in the Oedipus situation.

He acts as Prometheus acts. He wants to be what father is, to have what father has. And father's most valuable and envied possession, is the woman whom the boy wants to embrace and to hold forever, is the mother.

Perhaps it is no mere coincidence that Prometheus' mother is Gaia, earth. She is the productive and fertile mother of everything which grows. Prometheus creates men, his children, out of earth, from holy mud, blessed by the gods. He draws his children from mother's body. The dependant Prometheus could free himself only in going beyond his father, encroaching on his power and potency, the very potency which his father was about to misuse at the costly expense of mankind. Prometheus could have no choice. Zeus would never have given him independence without struggle. Prometheus could only sever the tie which kept him down in a violent or disguised way. He had to use any possible means, even rebellion and theft. The unavoidable basis for his creativeness was sin. He would have to commit sin if he was ever to be a creator. This was his tragedy, his tragic guilt!

It remains the tragic guilt of every son, of all human beings, a sin committed in spite of one's self, and for which legions atone throughout their existence. They live as those who never overcome the third step of Reik's scheme: As you do to me, so I do to me.

Still, Prometheus overcame it. He climbed to gigantic grandeur and grew beyond himself to a stature where he could well afford to forgive.

Goethe's Prometheus could not forgive. The beautiful poem was an outcome of Goethe's personal storm — and stress period in which everything in the poet was struggle and defiance. He gears away from mutual understanding, seeking anything but reconciliation with the father. His dare is challenge and defeat. It is young Goethe himself who through Prometheus says: (12)

Here I sit and shape men
In my own image,
A race to be like me,

That will suffer and weep,

Taste joy and delight,
And despise thee,
Even as I!

Goethe's genius, like Prometheus, may be creative even at this rebellious period of his life. Likewise creativeness springs from others who never reach the stage where they can generously forgive and accept forgiveness. Others never outgrow the fate of the self-punishing child who pays for insurrections throughout a life time, long, long after father and mother are gone.

A patient of mine is quite a gifted writer, who never succeeded in selling a story. Something appeared wrong with all of his productions. Either the topic was of interest to a very limited group, the plot was unrealistic, or a particular detail destroyed the entire effect. It seemed as if co-existing with his need to prove himself, a restrictive voice cried "success is not allowed you!"

Mac, the patient, had a somewhat inefficient father and a very efficient brother; a type of efficiency which Mac loathed. The father was a businessman who had been able to maintain an atmosphere of wellbeing as long as the children were small and needed his support. Although there was no want, there was never luxury in the house, and money remained scarce. Yet, the father found it possible to pay a housekeeper who cared for the children.

There was no mother to raise the two boys. She had died at Mac's birth when John, his brother was eight. Mother had been an energetic, kindhearted woman. She was encouraging, warm, and had both feet on solid ground. John, who enjoyed a mother's care and affection throughout early childhood, had a much better start than Mac. He had had time to build up confidence in himself and others. He eventually became a successful engineer, married early, and had two children. Mac, in contrast to John, was raised from the first day of his life by cold and disinterested housekeepers. Although they did their duties, none of them gave Mac the

love a child needs for healthy emotional development. Not a few of these women wanted to marry the goodlooking father. When efforts to please him failed, they gave up and left.

As it is the father was a weak person. It seemed as if he had used up all his energies to support the family as long as it was unavoidable. As soon as John had taken a job, and Mac was out of school, he changed. His business went slowly but steadily downhill. He seemed to communicate, "I did, what I could, I carried you until now, you can't ask me for more!"

Mac was closed in from two sides. The envied father of Mac's childhood was now incompetent; and there was John, efficient, envied, and yet disdained. Mac who hadn't known a mother's love, felt unwanted. He envisioned himself in everybody's way, a little zero among the other, all important people. Thus he had to make up for his feeling of nothingness. His means of accomplishment had to be special. To Mac nothing could be fulfilled by becoming a businessman or engineer. His mission lay in conquering a world. Mac saw himself as a "man-about-town", applauded by everybody, surrounded by beautiful women. He saw himself as a famous artist or writer, receiving fabulous royalties, honored and celebrated by outstanding people.

These daydreams served a twofold purpose. They helped him overcome a feeling of unimportance, and they allowed him to delay his grandious plans. He could now stay in the background and remain exempt from the frightening competition with father and brother. It was frightening from several points of view. For one he didn't feel strong enough to cope with John. He looked down on John's world as dull and unartistic. John's life was without color, his work without fantasy, his family life petty bourgeois, his horizon limited. Yet, it was the mechanism of the sour grapes fable. Mac had once wanted to be like father and brother.

Being successful would have meant outdoing them. It would have meant the theft of father's potency, castrating him, being responsible for his impotence. Father and brother

had been the incarnation of potency; Mac, the defeated one, was not entitled to reach out for this potency. He'd have had to be a Prometheus to dare it! Mac, if we may spare another term, suffered from the negative Prometheus problem, negative, because it could never be overcome and could not even allow Mac to assert himself in a rebellious way.

We have seen three outcomes of the same struggle, two productive, and a neurotic one. The mythologic Prometheus embraces the world; he conquers and makes it survive by love. The Prometheus of Goethe gets hold of the world, he is victorious in spite of spite and pride. Mac finally, might never have overcome this struggle at all, had it not been for psychoanalysis. At one point when he was offered a job for which he had been striving for many years, he became panicky and declined the offer. "I can't accept it", he said, "I'd belong to a society, where I could not be myself. I'd have to dress, behave and speak as society prescribes, not as I genuinely am." And then he added, "Strange, I would have no reason to rebel, and this would mean accepting this society." Mac "himself"—this was the unsuccessful person, all powerful in fantasy, yet helpless in reality.

Of the three only the mythological Prometheus succeeded in completely freeing himself from infantile fixations and incestuous attachments. He did so only after a bitter struggle, after punishment and atonement, and after having sacrificed part of himself to save the whole of himself and mankind. Finally he could give up the fight and competition and bring about a reconciliation of past and future. Goethe's genius stayed the same in the wildest storm of rebellion. Only Mac, mislead by neurotic trends, lost himself in fruitless withdrawal and daydreams.

But all of them were longing for the fulfillment of the great Promethean dream of mankind, a dream which beckons man to grow and develop into his independent, free, real self.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alexander Heidel, *Babylonian Genesis*, story of creation. I. Enuma. Elish, University of Chicago Press 1942, Chicago, Ill.
2. Otto Rank, *Art and Artist*, Tudor Publishing Comp., N.Y.
3. Salomon Reinach, *Aethos Prometheus, Myths et Religions*, Leroux, Paris 1907.
4. Hesiod, *Theogony*, *The Works of Hesiod*. Translated by Banks. Henry Bohn, London MDCCCLVI.
5. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, translated by Robert Whitelaw, in *15 Greek Plays*, Oxford University Press, New York 1943.
6. W. S. Fox, *Mythology of all Races*, 1936.
7. Gaston Bachelard, *La Psychanalyse du Feu*, Collection de Psychologie No. 7, Gallimard, Paris 1938.
8. S. Freud, *Acquisition of The Power over Fire*. Collected Papers Vol. V, 1932.
9. Karl Kereny, *Prometheus, das Mythologem der Menschlichen Existenz*. Alba Vigiliae 1946.
10. Theodor Reik, *Masochism in Modern Man*. Farrar, Strauss & Comp., 1949.
11. Anton Ehrenzweig, *The Origin of Scientific and Heroic Urge, The Guilt of Prometheus*. Int. Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 30, 1949.
12. J. W. Goethe, *The Poems of Goethe*, transl. by Bowring, Estes & Lauriat, Boston, 1883.

The Relation of Writers To Literary Criticism

by

Edmund Bergler, M.D.

To print is to run the gauntlet, and
to expose oneself to the tongue's strap-
pado.

Joseph Glanvill, "The Vanity of
Dogmatizing," 1661

I like criticism, but it must be my
way . . . I can live for two months on
a good compliment.

Mark Twain, 1900

In a long series of analyses of writers, summarized in my book, *THE WRITER AND PSYCHOANALYSIS* (1950), a section is devoted to scrutiny of writers' relations with critics. It was interesting to observe the combination of *justified* and *irrational* complaints.

The justified complaints were simple and straightforward. The average critic, claimed most of these patients, is a malicious negator of productivity because of his own artistic impotence. These critics, as Jean Paul Richter put it, "strip the tree both of blossoms and caterpillars." The malice of these critics was referred to as an essential part of their neurotic makeup; Nietzsche was quoted: "Insects sting, not in malice, but because they want to live. It is the same with critics; they desire our blood, not our pain." Why should a man who failed his test for a driver's license immediately become eligible for the job of examiner? The average reader's general lack of any opinion, and his consequent dependence on the critic, was deplored. One patient quoted Jean Sibelius: "Pay no attention to what the critics say; there has never been set up a statue in honor of a critic."

The *good* critic — as opposed to the incompetent average

critic — was considered a rarity. The good critic identifies helpfully with the struggling artist, instead of hitting him over the head regardless of whether or not his work deserves it.

There is little to add to this description; it is not likely that there will be objections to it from anyone who has written a book and had it reviewed.*

•

More interesting, because seldom discussed in public, was the *irrational* part of writers' grievances against critics.

It is a banality, and not a problem, that everybody wants praise. This wish for acknowledgment becomes a problem only when it becomes obsessive, or when criticism is neurotically intolerable.

The problem then becomes more complex than the popular formula: vanity requires confirmation, indicates. As stated in *THE WRITER AND PSYCHOANALYSIS*, the work of the productive writer constitutes the unconscious double defense he presents to his own inner conscience. A negative review is unconsciously taken as proof that the alibi has been rejected. Hence, the wish for "confirmation."

Experience proves the correctness of Glanvill's observation, by now three hundred years old: to publish is to run the gauntlet. Nevertheless, the typical writer is as upset by negative or derogatory criticism as he would be by a unique, entirely unexpected circumstance.

Logically, the reaction cannot be explained; it becomes intelligible when one realizes that the unconscious part of the personality is involved. *The internal bravado is changed into an external "strappado."* The masochistic allure is warded off with defensive fury — the identical allure which

* The correctness of these strictures on the average critic can be tested by everybody: how frequently one has the experience of seeing a book or a play one has liked "killed" in a critical review! The author's personal experiences were summarized in his study, "Literary Critics Who Can Spell But Not Read," *The American Imago*, 1951. In this study, a specific type of emotional reading block in critics is discussed, leading to typical misunderstandings in reviews.

prompted the variegated defenses in the work of art in the first place.

This explains the tragicomic dichotomy: Every writer thoroughly distrusts the critic; when his distrust is subjectively and specifically confirmed, he is astonished and shocked.

Nobody asks the writer to write and to publish. The moment he abandons the safe rule pronounced by Elbert Hubbard: "To avoid criticism, do nothing, say nothing, be nothing," and exposes himself, he is fair game. It is naive to be indignant over criticism.

This pertains, of course, to unjustified criticism. It is remarkable how frequently the neurotic attitude of critics is taken as an argument bolstering the writer's own "writer's block." I am reproducing parts of a discussion with such a patient; in our first interview he stated pessimistically:

"When I first thought of coming here my idea was to have you analyze away my urgent desire to be a writer. I agree with everything I've read — by other writers — about the miserable profession of writing. But, as you say in *THE WRITER AND PSYCHOANALYSIS*, if the writer is really a defendant before the tribunal of conscience, and his work is his alibi — well, he has to write."

"That's correct," I told him.

"After I understood that dilemma, I gave up the idea of having myself cured of the desire to write. I want to write — please remove my block. But if you do, what about the other dilemma that faces me? I know there's no cure for this one: it's hopeless to expect to write good stuff and earn money with it."

"Writers with some sense of reality know that; they make their living in a tangential profession, and write their serious work in their spare time. It cannot be done differently."

"But look at the contempt and irony directed at serious writers! There are quotations by the yard to prove it. Here's George Ade: 'After being turned down by numerous publishers, he decided to write for posterity.' Shaw

showed contempt: 'The writer who aims at producing the platitudes which are "not for an age but for all time" has his reward in being unreadable in all ages.' Robert Benchley followed the same ironic line: 'It took me fifteen years to discover that I had no talent for writing, but I couldn't give it up because by that time I was too famous.' Oscar Wilde was condescending: 'One should not be too severe on English novels; they are the only relaxation of the intellectually unemployed.' Colton, though he lived nearly three-quarters of a century earlier, said the same thing: 'Many books require no thought from those who read them, and for a very simple reason — they made no demands upon those who wrote them.' And what consolation is there in this quote from Dickens — 'There are books of which the backs and covers are by far the best parts' —? And Stanley Walker summed up the fate of the good writer in saying, 'He was an author whose works were so little known as to be almost confidential.' Who wants to be a 'confidential' author?"

"A nice collection which proves exactly nothing. Moods of despair are common to all writers — occasionally. And your collection isn't exhaustive by any means. What about that saying of Emerson's to the effect that 'people do not deserve to have good writing; they are so pleased with the bad'? Or this one from Don Marquis: 'Publishing a volume of verse is like dropping a rose petal down the Grand Canyon and waiting for the echo.' What of it? It's a well-known fact that the predominant figure in pseudo-literature is the hack. This doesn't prevent good writers from producing. But you hide your personal difficulties behind a generality — the low standing of literature in present day society. Why do you behave as if this were the finger of fate, pointing directly at you? You're only one of thousands who have to deal with this problem. And what about your sense of humor? You reeled off your collection of quotations with a half-serious, half-despairing facial expression. How could you have missed the point that three-quarters of these quotes are just witticisms — dealing, I'll

grant you, with a serious problem? Obviously, if you appreciated the fun you would be weakening your fantasy: 'Fate singled *me* out to make a flop of *me*!' "

In a situation of external danger, Oscar Wilde used the familiar plea of "wanting praise" as a defense. Here is the explanation he offered, during his trial in 1895, for his homosexual association with young boys:

Prosecutor: "You, a successful literary man, wished to obtain praise from these boys?"

Wilde: "Praise from any one is very delightful. Praise from literary people is usually tainted with criticism."

This naive, though true, statement explains what a famous writer in analysis told me:

"When critics praise me, I'm *mildly pleased*; if they write a negative review, it *hurts me deeply*."

Comparing both statements, Wilde's is nearer to the facts.

251 Central Park West
New York 24, New York

On Bullfighting

by

Winslow Hunt

Examination of the very comprehensive Psychological Abstracts back to 1927 uncovers only one article on bullfighting. It is surprising that so dramatic and anachronistic an institution has not received more attention from psychological writers, and particularly from psychoanalysts. The one article, however, is of considerable interest and in fact the present paper may be considered an extension of the line of reasoning developed therein. The article is by William H. Desmond and appeared in this journal in 1952. Dr. Desmond's central thesis is that the bullfight represents the ritual murder of the father by the son. He develops this idea from a wealth of historical and anthropological data and traces the continuity of bull-killing rituals from primitive occurrences, through the once widespread religion of Mithraism, to the modern bullfight.

My own reflections were occasioned by seeing several contemporary bullfights and were formulated before I had any knowledge of the historical background of the spectacle. Looking at the bullfight as one might look at any work of art, noting its symbolism and the emotions it arouses, I came to the same conclusion as that reached by Desmond via an historical approach, namely, that in its central unconscious significance the bullfight is an Oedipal drama which portrays the victory of the son over the father. In this paper we will examine the structure of the modern bullfight in more detail, considering the unconscious meaning of the proceedings, and with special reference to the question of how guilt for the parricidal impulses is avoided.

People have difficulty knowing what to call the bullfight. It has been variously considered as a sport, a festival (*fiesta*), an art, a drama (always a tragedy), and a ritual. There are

elements in the modern bullfight to justify each of these designations and it would be mere quibbling to defend any one of them as more correct than the others. However, bulls have been killed in different ways at different times and places and the meaning the activity has had for those who took part in it has varied greatly. Between the time when bulls were killed in Roman spectacles and in Mithraic ceremonies and the development of the modern bullfight, which has taken place since 1700, there was a long period in which bulls were fought merely as a sport. Bullfighting was an aristocratic pastime, in which a mounted man with a lance would pursue a fleeing bull or joust with a charging one, either on the open plains or in an arena. The sport, while dangerous and exciting, was unartistic, and there was nothing about the way in which the bull was killed to give dramatic force or emotional significance to the proceedings. Around 1700 the mounted aristocrats withdrew from the arena and the sport was taken over by plebians who fought on foot. The modern bullfight has developed since then and in its present highly stylized form it is the artistic creation of a series of brilliant matadors, from Francisco Romero, who introduced the use of the sword and the muleta, to Juan Belmonte, who developed the present "decadent" style in which the bullfighter moves slowly and delicately, and allows the bull's horns to pass very close to his almost motionless body. It is these men who transformed the crude sport into a beautiful drama-ritual.

The modern bullfight begins upon a trumpet call which signals the release of the bull into the ring. At first the matador's assistants run across the ring, letting the bull charge their capes, while the matador studies the quality and idiosyncrasies of this particular bull. This continues for a few minutes, and then the picadors, mounted on horseback, enter the ring. The bull charges the horses, doing them more or less injury, depending on the amount of padding they wear, while the picador pushes the end of his long, spear-like, pic into the large neck muscles of the bull. This slows the bull down and makes him carry his head lower. In the next stage of the fight three pairs of banderillas are

placed in the bull's shoulders. These are brightly colored pieces of wood, about a yard long, and with harpoon points. They are placed by means of a graceful maneuver in which a single man, without the protection of a cape, lets the bull charge him. The final stage, and the one that receives the greatest emphasis, is the *faena*. Here the matador is in the ring alone with the bull, controlling him with a piece of red cloth called the *muleta*. He has the bull make a series of charges, each time bringing him close to the matador's body. Here the matador can employ a whole repertoire of movements with the cape and the bull, and can display his skill and courage. Finally, when the bull is exhausted, he is killed from in front, with the sword.

Every bullfight is different, and varies with the individual qualities of the bull and of the bullfighters, but the overall sequence of events, as outlined above, is always the same. The entire fight takes about fifteen minutes. It must move along at a good tempo, for the bull learns quickly and, despite his fatigue, does not become less dangerous as the fight progresses. A bull which has once been fought, in any way, can never be used in the ring for he would be too wise to be manipulated with the cape and the second encounter would in all probability be fatal to the man.

People's reactions to the bullfight vary greatly, and this is especially true of foreign visitors. The spectator's attitude is apt to be influenced by extraneous factors, such as moral or humanitarian scruples or, since Hemingway, a desire to be fashionable and enjoy it. But few who have gone to the bullfights with a real openness and willingness to respond will deny that it is a very moving experience. So far as I know the emotions aroused have not been described with any great precision, but they are often considered similar to those aroused by tragic drama and Hemingway gives the general quality of these feelings, as they appear in the consciousness, when he says,

.... the bullfight is very moral to me because I feel very fine while it is going on and have a feeling of life and

death and mortality and immortality, and after it is over I feel very sad but very fine. (3)

However this "tragic sense" is only the end emotion, and is made possible by the catharsis which the bullfight gives to other feelings which do not become conscious.

These other feelings are those aroused by the underlying Oedipal drama which is the "plot" of the bullfight. This "plot" is the story of a battle between a father and a son. At first the son flaunts his courage and manliness, then he is attacked by the larger and initially more powerful father, and finally, after a series of encounters, he dominates and defeats the father. At the usual *corrida* this simple story is re-enacted six times in two hours: many aficionados have seen hundreds of fights, and those who like it do not get bored. This repetition is made possible by the realisticness and directness with which the drama is portrayed. The bull is really killed in the end. Bullfights are held in Portugal which have all the elements of Spanish fights except the organized plot and its resolution in the death of the bull. These fights apparently arouse only local interest and seem to totally lack the emotional power of the Spanish spectacle.

In order to understand more fully the way in which the bullfight achieves its effect let us begin with some non-analytic theories of its emotional appeal. We can then proceed through these ideas to a psychoanalytic understanding of what is happening within the spectator.

The most naive theory is that advanced by the tourist guide-books, which tell you that bullfights are fun because of the tradition, color and pageantry. This does not get us very far, for even the best staged pageantry becomes empty frippery if it is not justified by the significance of the occasion, and a coronation would have little interest to us if it did not, even now, mean something to a people to have a Queen.

The second theory, usually advanced by critics of the institution, suggests that the bullfight is popular because it affords gratification to sadistic impulses which are otherwise

prohibited by society. In an afternoon one can see six bulls injured and killed, with plenty of visible blood, and the chances of seeing a man gored are not bad.

... when we buy a ticket to the area we know we are buying a ticket to see death in action, certainly the death of several bulls, possibly the death of a man. ... the public had not paid to see Manolette run, it had paid to see death, his death if they were lucky (and one day they were). Blasco-Ibinez said it perfectly: The only beast in the Plaza de Toros is the crowd. (4)

Apologists for the bullfight claim that no manœuvre has as its purpose the causing of pain: they say that such pain as is inflicted is only incidental and is necessary to producing the most brilliant possible spectacle (3). In the case of a patient, if his actions consistently produce a certain result, we are inclined to at least suspect that he must obtain some kind of gratification from that result. If he claims that this result is only an incidental concomitant of his behavior, and nothing he desires or enjoys, we would tend to view this as merely a rationalization. There seems to be no need to reason differently about pain and the bullfight.

A third theory, which seems to be taken seriously by some, is that the bullfight is a symbolic representation of the struggle between form and chaos, or between spirit and matter. The process by which the calm and precisely moving matador subdues and kills the huge and raging brute is seen as the victory of intelligence and art over the crude and powerful forces of the world and of man's own nature.

... the matador who represents man's higher nature. The final stage leading up to the "moment of truth", as it is still symbolically called, represents the gradual complete domination by man of his ignorant passions, and can be achieved only by his own hand.*

Expressed in psychoanalytic terms this theory seems to say that the bullfight is a struggle between the ego and superego on one side and the id on the other, with the victory going to the forces of repression and sublimation.

*From Rodney Bright's *Toros Without Tears* as quoted in (4).

The difficulty with this theory is that what happens in a bullfight is usually on a lower level, ethically and culturally, than the public behavior of the society around it. Not only is there the above-mentioned blood and killing, but also, contrary to the usual requirements of sympathy, the matador whose life is at that moment in danger may be hissed and booed by persons sitting in safety if there is any break in his courage and poise, or if he does anything to lessen his risk. This spirit-and-form-over-matter-and-chaos theory is primarily a rationalization, a denial of the fact that strong and primitive impulses, far from being repressed and sublimated, are being amply gratified in the bullfight.

A fourth popular theory attributes the appeal of the bullfight to the danger which the matador faces and overcomes. The danger element works in two ways. Firstly, there is what might be called the "roller-coaster effect", where pleasure is derived from the creation of anxiety followed by the sudden release from it. When the bull charges into the ring the audience realizes that this bull may be too strong or too clever and, identifying with the matador, they are afraid. And when the end comes, with the bull dead and the bullfighter alive and well, they experience a profound relief. Also, with every "pass" the matador makes, the anxiety increases as the bull charges, and then, when the bull goes by and the matador is seen to be safe, there is a pleasurable release from tension. But this effect, like the sadistic gratifications, is not *the* emotion of the bullfight, but is only an element which contributes to the effect of the overall drama, which is the struggle between the son and the powerful father.

The danger element also works in another and deeper way. *Aficionados* attach great importance to the form and style of a matador and to the "genuineness" of his behavior in the ring. When one asks what exactly it is that makes a given movement artistic and genuine, one discovers that the essential element is that in good form the matador deliberately increases the risk to himself and endures the additional

danger with no failure of nerve. Hemingway explains this important point quite clearly:

But the matador, if he knows his profession, can increase the amount of the danger of death that he runs exactly as much as he wishes it is to his credit if he does something that he knows how to do in a highly dangerous but still geometrically possible manner.

. . . . instead of letting the horn go by his chest he has pulled away prudently so that with the danger removed man and bull do not form one group but are separate entities held together neither by emotion or plastic line. **A position which would be artistically correct becomes ridiculous without the danger of the horns and the necessary bulk of the bull to give it dignity.** (*italics mine*)

In this strange art it is absolutely essential that the central character be close to danger, and if it should ever happen that the sport develops in such a way that matadors are *never* killed or gored, the bullfight will lose its "emotion" and become extinct. It is necessary that the bullfight create the illusion of an equal struggle between the man and the beast, that is, between the son and the father. This illusion is not too hard to create. When one sees the great powerful bull with its long sharp horns, so fast and courageous in attack, the man looks weak and frail by comparison, and it seems that the struggle is not even equal, but that the bull has the advantage. Of course simple statistics tell us that the bull is sure to die, and that for a skilled and well-trained matador the risk is actually rather slight. But the unconscious makes little use of statistical reasoning, and it is the direct visual impressions that have force with it.

The insistence upon the matador's undergoing a very real danger is particularly clear in the matter of killing the bull. There is only one approved way to kill, and it is a dangerous method. The matador must approach the bull from directly in front, lean over the bull's lowered horns, and push the sword in between the animal's shoulder blades. If the bull raises his head at this moment there is nothing the man can do to avoid a goring.

It is the illusion of a fair and equal struggle that makes

it possible to act out the murder of the father in as full and as direct a form as is done in the bullfight. The superego is always ready with the accusation: "What do you mean by this wickedness? You are torturing, humiliating and killing your father, and you are doing it in public. You are an evil and disgusting person." To this the ego replies, "You can't talk of torture and killing here. This was a fair and honest fight. He was strong and dangerous and tried his best to kill me. I might have been cowardly but I was not. I faced the danger bravely and so I deserve to win." If the matador has fought well and has taken the risks he is paid to take, the ego's defense is convincing, the superego is appeased, and the bullfight is a satisfying experience. But if the bullfighter is cowardly, and kills the bull without taking the appropriate risks, then the spectator is threatened with feelings of guilt and he heaps scorn and abuse upon the weak-kneed matador. It is the matador's nerve and his willingness to accept occasional injury which makes it possible for the spectators to gratify their early and unconscious hatreds without paying heavily in guilt.

Because of his size, strength and temperament the bull is well suited for the symbolic role he plays. Our suppositions about the bull's virility are confirmed by the facts. On a ranch for raising fighting bulls there is usually one seed bull for every fifty cows, and this is quite enough. In these matters the matador does not let himself be outdone by his opponent. The matador seldom marries. His fans expect him to have many affairs, and they are seldom disappointed (3). Not only in the ring, but in his outside life as well, the matador plays the part of the son who defeats the father and takes all the women for himself.

It is a curious fact that the bulls which are actually used in the ring are virgin (2). This does not fit very well with our analytic theory. There may be some technical reason for this, but I know of none.

There is a tradition that if a bull has fought especially well his life may be spared at the wish of the crowd. This custom is frequently mentioned but very rarely observed

(5), a fact which in itself reflects the ambivalence felt towards killing the bull.

Another custom, which is actually practiced, supports our interpretation of the bullfight. If a matador has fought well the presiding authority may award him the bull's ears as a trophy. If he has fought with really exceptional courage and skill he may be awarded the ears and the bull's tail. The symbolism here is not obscure. On one such occasion I have seen a young matador, his face exalted with victory, walk twice around the ring holding his prize high for everyone to see. Members of the cheering audience threw their coats and hats into the ring as gifts to the hero, passed down bottles of wine from which he drank, and did everything possible to show their affection for him and their desire to associate themselves with him. It may be that the audience too has a special role to play in the drama. The audience seems to act the part of the mother who stands aside watching the conflict and then is willing, under certain circumstance, to give her love to the victor.

Up to now we have been going on the assumption that the emotion in the spectator is derived from an identification with the matador. However, there are layers below layers, and now we must look at it from the point of view of an identification with the bull. Since the bull's fate is pain and death, an identification with the bull must involve masochism and the wish to die. We all have looked on death as peace and rest, as a welcome release from the tension that wracks our lives. The wish for death is too well known to need further elaboration here.

However, even our behavior on our deathbed cannot escape the harsh scrutiny of nagging conscience. The pleasure which might come from death, or from the thought of death, is often destroyed by the superego, which may tell us that the way in which we are dying is foolish, weak, passive, or messy. Very few people are able to choose how they will die, and most ways of dying are, at the least, ugly and inarticulate.

This is not the case with the bull, however. Like the

hero of a tragedy, he dies with grace and style and, as it were, has a good closing line. The existence of bullfighting, not only technically but emotionally as well, depends on the existence of a strain of bulls whose instinct it is to charge viciously and without provocation, and to keep on charging right up to the end. The bull dies admirably, in a way that a man would be proud to die. It is a great satisfaction to identify with the bull, who looks to us as if he is granted the pleasure of death without having to feel ashamed of the manner of dying.

There are two lines of thought which can be opened up here, but which must be left unfinished. One concerns the matador's personality. We can speculate that Oedipal conflicts must exist in the matador with unusual intensity and that in some unknown way the defenses surrounding these conflicts permit him to act out this material with that exceptional degree of spontaneity necessary for survival in the bull ring. Sooner or later a matador will come to the couch, and then we may have some fuller knowledge of this.

The second question: Why is it that the bullfight exists only in Spain and in countries greatly influenced by Spanish culture? The fact that fighting bulls are native to Iberia may explain its origin in Spain, but not its failure to spread to other cultures. The answer to this question may involve factors relating to the degree of industrialization, the structure of the Spanish family and the whole obscure matter of national character. However I cannot do more at this time than raise the problem.

40 Grove Street
New York 14, N. Y.

References:

1. Desmonde, William H.: *The Bullfight as a Religious Ritual*, *American Imago*, 1952, 9, 173-195.
2. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *Bullfight*, Vol. 4, 371-373, Chicago, *Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.*, 1953.

-
3. Hemingway, Ernest: **Death in the Afternoon**, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
 4. Kemp, Lysander: **The Only Beast, Reflections on Not Attending the Bullfights** in *Discovery* 4, New York, Pocket Books, Inc., 1954.
 5. Marks, John: **To the Bullfight**, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

A Character Study of Samuel

by

Dorothy F. Zeligs

Many of the personalities of the Bible are as vividly alive and meaningful today as they were several thousand years ago. One wonders what there is about these biblical figures that has enabled them to retain their hold upon the imagination of men for so many centuries. Perhaps it is because their psychological struggles and achievements contain elements that find responsive chords in many people. More specifically, it seems that the biblical tradition offers an approach and an attempted solution to universal human problems in the conflict between instinctual and moral forces. This may be the factor which helps to give the great characters revealed in this literature a lasting significance.

We shall consider here the personality of Samuel, judge and seer, priest and prophet, who is believed to have lived from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the eleventh centuries, B.C. (1) The character of Samuel offers opportunity for a study in the psychology of leadership. His figure stands out with a kind of solitary impressiveness during this period of ancient Israel which served as a transition from the days of the "Judges" to the time of the Monarchy. The word *judge* in those days was synonymous with *leader* and described a person who achieved this position largely through his own abilities. Some of the judges were chiefly military leaders but in all of them the motivating force was always the religious one.

Samuel was a transition figure psychologically in a rather striking sense, being regarded historically as the last of the judges and also as ushering in the period of the prophets. Serving a people who lived a simple agricultural life, Samuel faced problems and tasks different from the later prophets of a more urban culture.

While he did not attain the heights of prophetic genius reached by some of those who came after him, Samuel filled a role which was uniquely his own. He acted as a unifying force during an era when his people was being seriously threatened by the conquering and oppressive Philistines. There was considerable danger that the Hebrew nation might disintegrate into separate tribal groups, each with its individual and probably transitory history. Through his moral leadership, Samuel helped to avert this disaster. Historians say that while Moses formed the Jews into a people, it was Samuel who helped to consolidate this process.

Samuel seemed to be a man peculiarly shaped both by his times and his personal history for the role he was to play. We shall try to evaluate this role in the light of the reciprocal relationships between the environmental forces that helped to create this leader and his own later influence upon the group.

The story of Samuel's life begins, significantly, with his parentage and the prenatal influences that were at work. His destiny was, in a more than usual measure, determined even before he was born. In fact, the account of his birth sounds like an idyllic folk-tale, a rather interesting variation of the myth of the birth of a hero. But because it is so highly plausible from a realistic point of view also, we shall consider it from both aspects.

The story concerns a woman, Hannah, who had no children. Her disappointment was the more keenly felt because there was a rival wife in this non-monogamous family, Peninnah, who was successful where Hannah had failed, being the mother of numerous offspring. This area of rivalry and jealousy is one which our culture has spared the modern woman but one can easily imagine what a source of distress or competitive satisfaction it must have been in those ancient days if the same household included more than one wife. The situation was aggravated because a woman's proficiency as a wife was judged largely on the basis of her child-bearing abilities. Sterility was regarded not only as a social stigma but as valid grounds for divorce.

Of the two wives, Hannah was the more beloved by Elkanah, the husband. On the occasion of the yearly pilgrimage to the sanctuary at Shiloh, where the family regularly came to make its sacrifice, he showed his love for Hannah in a special way. He gave Peninnah and each of her children a portion of the sacrificial meal, but to Hannah he gave a double portion. This evidently aroused Peninnah's jealousy for we are told that immediately after this, Hannah's rival "vexed her sore to make her fret, because the Lord has shut up her womb." This situation repeated itself year after year, on the same occasion.

At one of these times, Hannah was so vexed, she could not eat. Then Elkanah comforted her with tender words, saying, "'Hannah, why weepest thou? and why eatest thou not? and why is thy heart grieved? Am I not better to thee than ten sons?' "

After this, Hannah entered the Temple and prayed to God for a son, vowing that if her wish were granted, she would dedicate him to God's service for all his life.

A curious incident now took place. Eli, the old priest, sitting at the doorpost of the Temple, observed Hannah's somewhat unusual behavior. He noted the lengthy time she remained at her prayers, the evident intensity of her emotions, and the fact that although her lips moved, no sound came forth. He concluded that she was drunk and reprimanded her. Hannah explained quite humbly that it was not so, that she was a woman of sorrowful spirit who had poured out her soul before the Lord. The priest then gave her his blessing.

Eli's misjudgment of Hannah's behavior is interesting. Biblical commentators point out that this incident indicates that Eli must have been of a suspicious and distrustful nature. While this inference may be correct, one wonders if there might not have been some basis for the impression which Eli formed of Hannah as she prayed before the Ark. Perhaps there was something in Hannah's mood that was neither truly reverent nor prayerful. She entered the Temple to make her request of God shortly after Peninnah had

"sorely vexed her." She had refused to eat, so deeply was she disturbed. Vexation is a feeling that involves both anger and sorrow. Refusal to eat is a sign of hostility and protest against a parental figure. In this instance, it was the sacrificial meal of which Hannah refused to partake. This amounted to an angry rejection of God, the Father, Who had denied her a child. It was also a rejection of her husband, although he had shown his love by giving her a double portion.

Hannah's mood, therefore, when entering the Temple to pray for a child, must have been a mingled one in which anger played a large role. Indeed, when Eli rebukes her for being drunk and she denies this, she explains, "'Out of the abundance of my complaint and my vexation have I spoken . . .'"

One wonders why Hannah did not follow the usual custom of praying aloud. It was chiefly the fact that her lips moved soundlessly that aroused Eli's suspicion. Secrecy may have been a motive here, for she did not reveal even to Eli the nature of her fervent plea. The Bible says, "She was in bitterness of soul — and she prayed unto the Lord and wept sore." The contrast between this agitated behavior and the silently-moving lips must indeed have seemed incongruous to the observing priest. Hannah may have silenced her lips quite consciously and with some effort, since doing so was out of keeping both with custom and the intensity of her feelings. Her evidently strong wish for secrecy may have been a desire to spare herself any further humiliation, should her request not be granted. We can assume that considerable narcissism and vulnerability were present in this area. Her prolonged stay before the Ark indicates the degree of effort she must have put into her plea. This element is most obvious in the bargain she makes with God. If He will only fulfill her wish, the child would be returned to Him for a lifetime of service. Hannah would then be vindicated as a wife and God would gain a servant.

For Hannah, the birth of Samuel meant an answer to her prayer. She did not return to Shiloh again until the

child was weaned. This was a matter of several years, for in those days children were not weaned until they were two to three years of age.

Hannah's refusal to accompany Elkanah on the yearly trip to the sanctuary during the years of Samuel's infancy seems a little puzzling. The distance from Ramah, the village where the family lived, to Shiloh, was only about twelve miles. (2) She could have taken the child with her and traveled in a cart or on a donkey. Nothing is said about the possible hardships of such a journey. Some biblical commentators infer that Hannah remained at home so that she would be able to spend as much time as possible with the child before she had to give him up. But if Samuel had not yet been weaned, she would have had to take him with her anyhow.

Hannah's own words give a clearer indication of the reason. The Bible says, "But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband, 'Until the child be weaned, when I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord and there abide forever.' "

It seems likely that not until she could present her child to Eli as the dramatic fulfillment of her prayer, the triumphant denouement to the little scene in the Temple, did Hannah wish to appear before Eli again. Samuel was to be the joyful vindication, not only in the eyes of a rival Peninnah, not only of Hannah's role as a wife, but also before Eli, who had so cruelly misjudged her.

And indeed Hannah makes the most of the situation when the great moment finally arrives. After the appropriate sacrifice is made, the child is brought before Eli and Hannah says, " 'Oh, my lord, as thy soul liveth, my lord, I am the woman that stood by thee here, praying unto the Lord. For this child I prayed; and the Lord hath granted me my petition which I asked of Him; therefore I also have lent him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he is lent to the Lord.' "

Then Hannah prays to God. This time her prayer is quite in contrast to the silence of her earlier plea. She ex-

presses her exultation in a ringing hymn of praise and thanksgiving that declares loudly her triumph over her enemies and her sense of identification with an omnipotent God, Who is clearly on her side.

Some biblical critics believe that this hymn was written at a much later date but was placed here because it seemed to fit the occasion so well. Since controversy covers so much of the field of biblical criticism, we shall enter into this problem only to the extent of agreeing that the song does indeed seem to express Hannah's feeling in a way that is harmonious with what we have seen of her character.

There is not a single word in the text to indicate feelings of sorrow or loss as the woman leaves her child in the Temple with Eli. One must indeed wonder how real Hannah's love for her child could have been. She brought him into the world and suckled him with the sole intention of returning him to God, Whose gift he was. The boy could not have had much meaning to her in and for himself. More likely, he was a narcissistic part of herself which she was sacrificing to the God Who had saved her ego from the hateful gibes of her rival.

Hannah thus reveals her character with impressive clarity in the brief space that is devoted to her. She is a woman with a large amount of narcissism, which has been wounded by her barrenness. She is determined in her efforts to repair this damage to her ego. Hannah is able to make a plan and to carry it out on a long-term basis, postponing satisfaction until she can enjoy it at the peak of fulfillment.

A certain type of narcissistic woman is, in a sense, a "phallic" woman, to whom a child symbolizes a penis. (3) This kind of narcissism may develop out of identification with the father instead of taking him as a love object. The strong, unconscious wish for a penis may motivate the intensity of the desire for a child. Such a woman, because of the repressed aggression she is bound to have toward the sexual partner, who has the coveted organ, and the fear of retaliation which is bound up with her hostile impulses, will not be able to perform her sexual role without conflict.

Hannah's barrenness may have been caused by a psychogenic barrier of this type. Had she been a more truly feminine woman, her natural wish for a child would have expressed itself with more of longing than of rage, and she would not have been so willing to give up the child as a bribe. Samuel represents her bargain with God by which she returns to the "father" the penis she once wanted to take from him. Her sense of guilt is thus appeased. When her narcissistic wound is healed by the birth of Samuel and her atonement is accomplished by keeping her promise, Hannah's tensions are evidently lowered and she is able to function more naturally as a woman and to produce a number of other children.

This need for dedicating Samuel to God's service can be understood as stemming from the same psychological sources as the actual practice of child sacrifice. But the differences involved are tremendous in their import for the moral and cultural development of humanity. Hannah's sense of guilt finds atonement in an act of service to a forgiving Father rather than in the appeasement of a bloodthirsty god. Hannah's God asked for a living servant, not a sacrifice of death. We can see her action, therefore, as a form of sublimation, an upward step on the road to morality and culture in her world of three thousand years ago. It indicates the effect of a monotheistic religion with its accompanying moral code upon the life of her times. (4)

Before continuing with the exposition of Samuel's personality development, let us pause to consider the story of his birth from another viewpoint, the myth of the birth of a hero. How does this account compare with the traditional forms as described by Otto Rank? (5) Here is a much-wanted child who comes after a period of barrenness. This is in harmony with the typical patterns. The future predicted for him is not one of disaster and disgrace to his parents and himself, but of service to the exalted Father. This sounds like a successful sublimation of the forces present in the original Oedipus myth. Instead of being abandoned by royal parents and rescued by humble ones, Samuel is tenderly nurtured by his own lowly mother and father for

the sake of preparing him for a higher estate. This is a direct reversal of the usual myth. The theme of abandonment, however, remains in disguised form, another aspect of the sublimatory forces at work in the myth. The first indication of the child's destined role comes, not at birth, but at puberty, as we shall see later. This is significant, perhaps, of the concept that he is not the helpless object of Fate but has a voice in his own future.

The task which Samuel faces can also be seen as a reversal of the usual Oedipus myth. He saves Israel from sin and brings her repentantly back to the Father. Later prophetic symbolism frequently depicted Israel as an erring woman who must be restored to the pure worship of God. This is the traditional task of a biblical hero. Freud says that in the heroic myth, "the hero was a man who by himself had slain the father." (6) But Samuel reverses the role. It is not he who is guilty of wrongdoing, but his people, symbolic of the mother. He rescues the mother from ruthless conquerors and strange gods, bringing her back to the Father. By sublimating his incestuous wishes and identifying himself with the Father, Samuel shares in His omnipotence. This enables him to function as a spiritual leader and hero.

There is an interesting harmony between the story of Samuel's birth and dedication to God when viewed on a reality basis as the result of Hannah's personality conflict and when seen as a reversal of the usual myth. In both situations Samuel represents an overcoming of forbidden sexuality and aggression and their successful sublimation.

The character of the mother must have had an important influence upon Samuel's development during the first few years of his life. We are becoming increasingly aware of how profoundly parental attitudes affect the emotional development of the child from earliest days. The long nursing period characteristic of those times allowed more opportunity for the attitudes of the mother to be communicated to the infant at her breast.

One might expect that the child of a narcissistic mother

would be somewhat slow in the process of individuation and ego development, being unconsciously influenced by the mother's need to regard him as an extension of her own body. But Hannah's compensatory strivings evidently tended toward sublimation and reaction formation, processes which were symbolized in the very person of the small Samuel. Her attitude toward the infant boy, therefore, would express not only a narcissistic treasuring but a reactive process of giving him up in accordance with superego demands. This must have led to an early development of the child's own ego-ideal. One can imagine the mother's frequent admonition to the small boy that he was promised to God and could not misbehave as other children did. He was a "holy" child, set apart from others. Freud says, "The development of the ego consists in a departure from the primary narcissism and results in a vigorous attempt to recover it. This departure is brought about by means of displacement of libido to an ego-ideal imposed from without, while gratification is derived from the attainment of this ideal." (7) In another connection, Freud postulates that "a premature advance of the ego-development ahead of the libido-development contributes to the obsessional disposition." (8) Samuel, the religious leader, gave considerable evidence of an obsessional disposition. It seems logical to assume that the early environmental experiences referred to above helped to bring this about.

In spite of the compensatory factors at work within the mother, she must indeed have been lacking in genuine love for her child. The only indication of Hannah's tender feelings for the small boy is the statement that she brought him each year a linen robe which she made herself.

In contrast, the father seems to be a man of warm emotions. He comforts his wife with loving words when she is unhappy. He lets her have her way when she does not wish to accompany him to Shiloh before the child is weaned. Elkanah's mildness and warmth, therefore, may have had an alleviating effect upon Samuel's early environment.

The father was evidently in complete agreement with

Hannah's plan of giving up the child to God's service. Whether his acquiescent attitude came out of his own convictions, stemming from his obviously religious frame of mind, or whether it was a sign of passive yielding to Hannah's will, there is little way of knowing. A suspicion that some element of the latter might have been involved arises on the basis that narcissistic women tend to choose passive husbands and vice versa. Samuel may therefore have had a rather passive and submissive father as a model for identification in the first few years of his life.

To the modern reader of the biblical story, it must seem rather impractical as well as unpsychological to leave a child of two or three to do service in the Temple. At this age he would certainly be much more of a burden than a help. But if he was brought there in the nature of a sacrifice, as we assume, then the actual consequences would be less important than the unconscious meanings. Perhaps, also, the importance of early training in terms of environmental influence might have been a determining factor according to the concepts of those times. It is probable that some of the women in the Temple service took care of the child.

Samuel himself could have experienced this separation from his parents only as an abandonment, and his emotional development must have been deeply influenced by it. The fact that this separation probably occurred shortly after his weaning must have greatly increased the trauma. Soon after losing the breast, he also lost the mother.

One wonders if this experience may be related to the fact that there is hardly any reference to women in the whole of Samuel's life history. The whole area of women and sexuality seems to have undergone a severe repression, as we shall note in more detail later.

The father-figure was evidently replaced by Eli, with whom a close identification must have followed, and through Eli, with the God he represented. The boy's character development, therefore, would have been along the lines of submission and obedience to God, the need for sacrifice to

Him, and at the same time, a deep sense of personal destiny. This was a continuation of the attitudes with which his parents had presumably surrounded him from the time he was born. Samuel had to learn unquestioning obedience to the ritual of the Temple, a rigorous discipline which placed duty to God above the gratification of instinctual desires. But it was largely a discipline which was sanctioned from within, for Samuel seems to have accepted whole-heartedly the goals which were set for him. This harmony between ego and superego ideals may have been one of the main sources of his strength. The three important adults in Samuel's early environment all concurred in an implicit acceptance of what his life was to be. He was trained for his career in much the same way that a small child in a royal family is brought up from earliest days for a life of special duty and special privilege.

This kind of training, which is based on empathic acceptance of values and standards, of that which is implicit rather than expressed, has tremendous efficacy because it meets with so little resistance. The still rather mysterious process of empathy has various aspects. As Freud points out, "A path leads from identification by way of imitation to empathy." (9) This form of imitation must be based on unconscious factors found in identification to the more conscious ones that lead to empathy with its aspects of self-awareness and controlled acceptance of goals. (10)

The next incident which the Bible records of Samuel's youthful days at Shiloh took place sometime between the age of twelve to fifteen. It is the story of his mystic experience when God reveals Himself to him for the first time. Coming as it did, about the age of puberty, this call to the priesthood can also be seen as a kind of initiation to adulthood. The emphasis here, however, is not upon the sanction for adult sexuality but on a special relationship to the Father and to the people of Israel. The increased sexual energy of this period must have lent a special intensity to the aim-inhibited goals of this youth who, in all probability, did not have normal opportunities for coping with his earlier

Oedipal problems. Freud says that "if the ego has not succeeded in mastering the Oedipus complex satisfactorily, the energetic cathexis of the latter, springing from the id, will find an outlet in the reaction formations of the ego-ideal." (11)

There are dramatic and moving elements in the familiar story of Samuel's call to service. The boy, sleeping in the Temple, hears a voice calling to him out of the night and thinks it is Eli, the priest, summoning him. He runs to Eli, who is probably asleep in an adjoining alcove, and asks if he has called. The third time this incident is repeated, Eli realizes that an unusual event is taking place and tells Samuel that God is calling him and how to reply.

In the phenomenon that follows, Samuel experiences the presence of God both as a visual and as an auditory revelation. We are told that "the Lord came and stood and called" The intensity of Samuel's psychic response seems to find expression here.

What could have been the nature of his experience, psychologically speaking? In his interesting article on prophets of the Old Testament, Arlow explains Samuel's call as a hallucinatory one, similar to those experienced by other prophets who felt themselves summoned to God's service. (12)

The fact that Samuel thought Eli was calling him may not have been far from the truth. It does not seem too improbable to view this experience as a telepathic communication between Eli and Samuel, so closely identified with each other. If telepathy can utilize dreams as a medium for communication, then it cannot be too far-fetched to consider that hallucination may be used in the same way. (13)

The impression that telepathy is involved is strengthened by the fact that the content of the communication which Samuel receives is almost identical with an earlier "message" of which Eli himself was the recipient. We are told that Eli is visited by a "man of God" who predicts that the priest's two sons, who have been behaving wickedly, would not succeed their father in the priesthood, but would be cut off in the prime of life. Eli, moreover, is censured

for his leniency in that he saw his sons doing evil and "rebuked them not." He is told that God has chosen another as His faithful priest. Who could this other be but Samuel, whom Eli must have loved as the worthy son who did not disappoint him.

Since there were no outstanding seers or prophets at this time who would have dared to reproach the Head Priest, we must assume that this "man of God" was Eli's own superego, which perhaps revealed itself to the old man in a dream or hallucinatory experience. It bears evidence of his own clear inner decision of the painful course he had to take in rejecting his own sons, and his sense of guilt regarding them. The pain is alleviated by projecting this decision on God and receiving it from a mysterious messenger.

It is immediately following this event that Samuel receives his "call." The message again consists of God's angry repudiation of Eli's sons and the dread punishment that will be meted out to them. Again the old priest is referred to in censorious terms because he failed in his responsibility in not properly disciplining his sons. Samuel's own selection as priest and prophet is not actually voiced in this communication. It seems to follow by inference. The very fact that God reveals Himself to him is an acceptance in deed rather than in word. Only an accepted prophet of God receives His revelations. The import of this experience is emphasized by the explanation, "And the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no frequent vision." Thus, in both content and time sequence, the experiences of Eli and Samuel seem to have a direct relationship to each other. The old priest whose "eyes had begun to wax dim," and the ambitious young novice, ready to enter upon his spiritual inheritance, were psychologically prepared to communicate with one another on this important issue. Since Eli "received" the message first, the telepathic call probably emanated from him and found a quick but uneasy reception in the all too ready adolescent.

There is evidence of guilt feelings on the part of both

Eli and Samuel because the rejection and prophecy of death regarding Eli's sons are involved. Evidently it was no small matter to predict the disinheritance and removal from high office of the sons of a priestly family. The fact that this would be accomplished by their untimely death greatly increases the tensions. These ominous events are revealed to the youthful Samuel with the dramatic introductory words, " 'Behold, I will do a thing in Israel at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle.' "

It is no wonder that this decision had to come from God Himself. It is also understandable that in Samuel's "vision" the explicit mention of himself as the chosen one could not find a place, for his selection was associated with the destruction of his competitors. We are told that Samuel "feared to tell Eli the vision," and did so only upon urging. Eli once more alleviates his own pain by replying, " 'It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good.' "

Thus, Eli communicates his decision to Samuel on the level of unconscious awareness and Samuel then re-communicates to Eli on a different level of consciousness what the old priest had told him in the first place.

It seems likely that Samuel was endowed with a particular psychic sensitivity from earliest days. His mother's sensitivity to unconscious processes may have been communicated to him through empathy. Moreover, Samuel's whole life tended toward the development of this kind of psychic responsiveness. He spent his youthful years ministering in the Temple instead of participating in the usual carefree play or physical tasks on the farm that the average boy was heir to. The rigidity with which ceremonial in the Temple had to be carried out, the boy's sense of closeness to God at an early age, and the repression of his sexual feelings, must have helped to develop in Samuel a readiness and a need for the displacement of libido to this type of psychic phenomena. More specifically, one can conjecture that Samuel's personality was characterized by heightened narcissism brought about by his early experiences as pre-

viously described. Freud reminds us that the ego-ideal is the heir to this youthful narcissism. (14) It seems appropriate, therefore, that upon reaching an age for being "in love", Samuel projected his ego-ideal upon God and entered into a new relationship with Him.

The personality of Eli must also have had an important impact upon the young boy placed in his care at such a tender age. We do not know much about Eli. The fact that his sons were so violently rebellious must certainly have some relatedness to the character of the father. They were guilty of such extremes of misconduct as forcing the worshippers to yield up a larger share of the sacrificial meat than was due to the priests, and even of committing acts of sexual misbehavior with women at the very doors of the Temple. This flagrant defiance of the father could only have been related to a deep hatred for him and a desire to hurt and humiliate him. One must infer that Eli was responsible to some degree for such feelings in his sons. His leniency towards them may have been a defense against his own awareness of guilt. It is likely that he was better able to bestow more tender feelings upon the young Samuel than he could give his own children with whom he was probably involved in ambivalent attitudes.

It is noteworthy that at a later date Samuel's sons, also, did not develop into worthy personalities and they too were unacceptable as successors to their father. This similarity of experience may well indicate how closely Samuel identified with Eli and took over important patterns of his personality. The psychological factors which made the sons of Eli rebel against their father may also have led the sons of Samuel later on to rebel against similar qualities in Samuel himself. It seems that men who have a strong identification with a severe God-imago and, at the same time, become submissive to such a strong father-figure, cannot provide a healthy model of masculine identification for their sons. They may tend, on the one hand, to set up superego demands to which they themselves have submitted and, on the other hand, to be

overly lenient in unconscious awareness of their own inadequacy as fathers and their guilt feelings.

Samuel's reputation as a prophet evidently became firmly established throughout all Israel while he was still a youth. We are told that "the Lord was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground. And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord."

In a sense, Samuel was a child prodigy. He was the only one among the prophets of Israel who began his prophetic career at such an early age. As with child prodigies in other fields and at other times, such a position is often a vulnerable one for later achievements.

Samuel was about twenty-two when the most catastrophic event of his life and of his times occurred. The Hebrews suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of the Philistines. Certain happenings associated with this event must have greatly increased the trauma for Samuel. In the last desperate battle, the Hebrew soldiers resorted to an extreme measure. The Ark was taken from the Temple at Shiloh and brought into the battlefield, upheld by the two sons of Eli. The purpose of this strategy was to arouse terror in the hearts of the Philistines and to bolster the courage of the Israelites. But the plan turned out to be a boomerang. The Philistines felt so threatened by the actual presence, as it seemed to them, of the terrifying God of the Hebrews that they fought with increased energy and resolution. The Hebrews were defeated and the Ark itself captured by the enemy.

The bad news was brought to Eli as he sat anxiously awaiting word of the outcome. When he heard that not only was the battle lost and his two sons killed, but the Ark itself taken, the old man must have lost consciousness. He fell off his seat, suffered a broken neck and died.

It seems very puzzling that not a single word is given about Samuel and how he reacted to these shocking events. At one blow he lost the man who had been both father and priest and also the sacred Ark which must have been more than a mere symbol to him. He had been brought up in

its presence and for him it must have been the abode of God in a special sense. Moreover, according to archeological findings, Shiloh itself was evidently taken by the Philistines at this time and the sanctuary destroyed.

According to biblical chronology, twenty years pass before we hear of Samuel again. (15) This striking omission to any reference about the life of the chief personality of this period is certainly strange.

According to tradition, the first twenty-four chapters of the first book of Samuel, dealing with material up to the time of his death, were written by the prophet himself. (16) If this is so, the long interval of silence could express Samuel's own denial and repression of a traumatic period in his life. He may have been so overwhelmed by the great disaster that he wished to draw an amnesiac veil over the years that followed. Even if these chapters represent a composite authorship, as claimed by biblical criticism, the same psychological mechanisms could still be involved, representing the attitudes of the scribes of that day. To them, too, the years of humiliating subjection to the Philistine overlords that followed the military defeat must have been a painful period to deal with. They must have felt, also, that Samuel actually did fail them by allowing such a thing to happen to his people. Had he really been a powerful leader and prophet, he could have persuaded God to turn the victory in favor of the Israelites.

Samuel, too, must have felt that God had deserted him, and with him, his people, who had been given over to the enemy. He was the servant of a rejected people, a factor which would greatly increase his own feelings of rejection. This second great abandonment of his life must have affected him profoundly.

The conquest of territory by the enemy could also have symbolized to Samuel the seizure of "the mother" by the enemy. (17) It was his duty to protect the mother and to keep her safe from hostile forces. In this task he had now failed. He was no longer a hero but an abandoned child.

It is interesting that after the traumatic events, Samuel

made Ramah his chief abode. He returned to the home of his early infancy. Was he perhaps seeking the bit of earth, "the mother," where he had once known the warmth and security of a nursling?

The same tendency of repressive silence that hangs over this period is seen in relation to the Ark and the Temple at Shiloh. The destruction of the latter is not even mentioned in Samuel. There is a later reference to a place called Nob, where the priests then had a house. As for the Ark, when it was returned to the Hebrews by the Philistines after the fearful and wonderful happenings which are related in connection with its sojourn among Israel's enemies, it was not brought back to a Temple. The Ark was set up in a new locality, within a private home, under a special guardianship appointed for its care.

Why was the sanctuary not rebuilt and the Ark restored to its proper place? Why did not Samuel resume his priestly duties in a Temple as before? We have no factual answers to these questions and can only assume that psychological factors were involved. The Ark, which had been so meaningful in his life before, must have become the symbol of rejection, not only to Samuel, but to the people of Israel as well. For the same reason, Shiloh also had to be forgotten. Into the silence of these years can be read the defensive reactions of repression and regression needed to endure the losses Samuel suffered. The favored child of God, known to all Israel as the Lord's appointed prophet, had too suddenly been hurled from his narcissistic security and the youthful confidence in his own powers. By renouncing the Ark and a Temple, Samuel was, in a sense, rejecting the God Who had rejected him.

The next time we hear about Samuel, after the long interval of silence, he is serving as a circuit judge and priest, moving from town to town, with Ramah as the headquarters. What took place in his life during these years can only be conjectured. It seems likely that he served to some degree in the capacities which he is filling at the time when the story is resumed. The fact that he is still an acknowledged

leader when he reappears in the biblical account indicates that he must have been active to some degree.

Samuel's story is resumed almost as if there had been no lapse of twenty years. He tells the people to put away their false gods and return to the Lord and he would pray for them. Thus Samuel ties up the thread of his broken life at the very point where it had come apart. He leads his people back to God and in doing so, finds again the reason for his own existence. This return may represent the successful "working through" of his traumatic experience.

While the Hebrews are gathered at Mizpah for prayer and sacrifice, the Philistines move against them once more, probably assuming that they have come together for militant purposes. Then Samuel prayed to God for his people and, we are told, the Lord answered him, causing a great storm which unnerved the Philistines so that they fled before the pursuing and attacking Israelites. After this, "the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more within the border of Israel; and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel."

The victory is clearly attributed to Samuel's intercession with God. We must assume that the earlier defeat was just as clearly, although silently, accepted by Samuel himself as a personal one, even though Eli was then still alive. After his triumphant spiritual leadership, Samuel became known as the "great interceder." That the old wounds left their scars, however, is indicated by the fact that Samuel never had the Temple rebuilt nor the Ark restored to its rightful place. He continued to serve as a judge and priest for the people, making his rounds among them. He performed the sacrifice upon a hilltop and joined them for the sacrificial meal.

The latter part of Samuel's life is associated with the first two kings of Israel, Saul and David, in the time of the monarchy. These are the two kings whom Samuel himself selects and anoints.

This new development in the history of Israel begins in a dramatic fashion. The elders of Israel come to Samuel

at Ramah and request that he appoint a king over them because Samuel is old and his sons are not worthy to succeed him. Samuel was probably over seventy then.

This request threw Samuel into a state of conflict. He must have experienced it as the third great abandonment of his life. First his parents abandoned him, then God Himself, in a certain sense, and now, the people of Israel, to whose service he had dedicated his life. True, as they pointed out, he was now an old man. Israel was in need of a young and vigorous personality who could unite the tribes and lead them in war. Their independence and actual possession of the land could only be secured by military strength. The request made by the elders therefore had a sound realistic basis. What they were asking for was a certain separation of church and state, a temporal leader in addition to a religious one.

Samuel's first reaction was one of anger and hurt. So strong was this feeling that it had to be alleviated in the form of a reassurance from God, Who told him that it was not Samuel whom the people were rejecting, but God Himself, since the request for an earthly ruler indicated a lack of faith in the Heavenly King. Thus Samuel defends himself against feelings of rejection. At the same time, he reluctantly accepts the reality of the need and agrees to fulfill their request, this compliance being in accordance with God's instructions. Here Samuel's identification with God is so encompassing that even God is pictured as having ambivalent attitudes for a kingship for Israel. God tells him to warn the people of the burdens which a king will impose upon them and Samuel does so in words of classic impressiveness which still ring true. Not many generations later, King Solomon brought to reality many of the evils which Samuel predicted. But seen from the viewpoint of Samuel's personality, this conflict represented an inner struggle between his narcissism and his sense of reality.

Together with Samuel's feelings of personal rejection must have been the fact which he could no longer keep from awareness of his sons' unworthiness and his own fail-

ure as a father. The sons of Samuel, like the sons of Eli, were corruptible, in contrast to their fathers. Eli's leniency must have been true of Samuel also. He made his sons judges although he must have known that they would not be able to fulfill their duties meritoriously because of the moral weakness of their characters. In the moving speech which Samuel makes to the people on the occasion when Saul is anointed king, Samuel not only talks about his own services to the people but mentions his sons, saying, " 'And behold, my sons are with you.' " Thus he ignores the fact that the people had rejected his sons and puts them forward again as if they were an important contribution which he was making.

One wonders if Samuel's weakness as a father had a relationship to his role as a husband. It is significant that this area of his life is completely omitted from the biblical account. The first indication we have of his married state is the reference to his sons. The fact of his marriage or the name of his wife is not mentioned. Such a complete omission is unusual even though the Bible tends to treat such matters lightly. We can assume that this area of Samuel's life was a conflictful one and therefore subjected to repression. If his attitude toward his sons was ambivalent, as one could expect in a personality with such strong father ties, then his guilt feelings would explain his leniency toward his sons and his wish to keep their moral turpitude from awareness.

The relationship between Samuel and Saul, first king of Israel, has aspects of psychological interest which involve the latter as well as the former. We will confine ourselves primarily, however, to those elements which concern Samuel himself.

Samuel meets the future king of Israel under circumstances which are vividly descriptive of the life of the times. Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, sets out with a servant to seek the lost asses of his father. The quest brings them farther and farther from home until they find themselves in the city where Samuel is staying. Saul's

servant suggests that they consult the "seer" concerning the whereabouts of the strayed animals. This is indicative of the varied roles that a "man of God" was expected to fulfill in those days. He was not only priest, judge, and prophet, but also a kind of clairvoyant who was expected to help people with such small matters as locating lost asses.

The relationship between Samuel and Saul, from their first meeting to the last tragic denouement, seems to throw into sharp focus characteristic aspects of Samuel's personality and patterns of behavior. One gets the impression that this selection of a king was a task upon which Samuel and God entered with a special kind of cooperative intimacy. It seems as if Samuel was now seeking from God the personal closeness which he needed as a form of reassurance. We are told that God had revealed to Samuel the day before the full details of Saul's coming, informing him that this young man was to be the Lord's anointed. Samuel was fully ready, therefore, to receive Saul and to prepare him for the great role destined for him. Saul becomes Samuel's honored guest at the sacrificial meal and goes to his home for the night. The next morning Samuel anoints Saul secretly as king of Israel.

One wonders on what basis Samuel made this particular choice of Saul for the kingship. What qualifications did the man possess? We are told that he was "young and goodly, and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he; from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people."

Samuel's response to seeing this tall and handsome man may have been an immediate, intuitive reaction based on characteristic psychic sensitivity that here was a man truly fit for a king. His youth and sturdy physique would fit him for military leadership and place him in a role that would make him as non-competitive as possible with Samuel himself. The fact that Saul came from the tribe of Benjamin, the smallest and therefore least significant numerically, and that he was the son of a simple peasant family, must also have made him less threatening to Samuel. As the be-

wildered Saul himself exclaims, " 'Am I not a Benjamite, of the smallest of the tribes of Israel? And my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? Wherefore then speakest thou to me after this manner?' "

On another level, Samuel may have selected Saul on the basis of unconscious narcissistic identification. Saul may have represented his ego-ideal on a physical basis. But this love object was also a rival and as such was bound to be associated with ambivalent feelings. (18)

The process of initiating Saul into the kingship was significant of the relationship which Samuel desired between them. There was the communal meal of the sacrifice at which Samuel presided and on the following morning the secret anointment. Then Samuel showed his powers as a clairvoyant, telling Saul of a series of incidents that would occur as he proceeded upon his homeward journey. First he would meet two men who would inform him that his father's asses had been found; then he would meet three men carrying sacrifices to God, and they would give him two of their three loaves of bread. After this, he would meet a band of prophets coming down from a place of worship, playing upon their musical instruments and prophesying. And the spirit of the Lord would come upon Saul and he would prophesy with them and would be turned into another man. The Bible then says, "And it was so, that when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart; and all those signs came to pass that day." When Saul met the band of prophets "the spirit of God came mightily upon him, and he prophesied among them." The people looked at him wonderingly and said to one another, " 'What is this that is come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?' "

Saul, the simple peasant youth, thus suddenly becomes changed into another man; he is given another heart. This sounds very much like a hypnotic experience. The anointment, the magic words spoken by Samuel, " 'On whom is the desire of Israel? Is it not on thee and on all thy father's house? Is it not that the Lord hath an-

ointed thee to be a prince over His inheritance?" " The actual anointing was followed by the posthypnotic suggestion that Saul would become a changed man when he met the band of prophets.

A word of explanation about the young, roving men of God whom Saul encounters is in place here. They are first mentioned during the days of Samuel and it is assumed that he helped to organize and foster these groups of young people who wandered around the country with their musical instruments, small harps, timbrels, and pipes, singing and prophesying. Their purpose evidently was to arouse the religious spirit among the people, to induce backsliders to give up their false gods and return to the God of Israel. They performed a function similar to the religious revivalists at the gospel prayer meetings so popular in our own time. Samuel seems to have been peculiarly fitted to arouse this type of mystic, emotional upsurge of religious feeling in these young men, many of whom may have been his pupils and devotees. This same power, greatly increased, Samuel must have exerted upon Saul, with the expectation, consciously or unconsciously, of making him a puppet king whose spiritual strength and grace were to come from Samuel himself.

It is only after Saul proves his military leadership by saving the beleaguered city of Jabesh-Gilead that he is publicly anointed as king of Israel. It is also on this occasion that Samuel relinquishes his position as sole leader and bestows the power of ruler upon another. That this was a poignant moment in Samuel's life is revealed in the speech he made to his people. His appeal to them strikes one as very moving yet oddly irrelevant. He says, in part, " 'Here I am; witness against me before the Lord, and before His anointed; whose ox have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? or whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I taken a ransom to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will restore it to you.' And they said: 'Thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken aught of any man's hand.' "

Why does Samuel feel this need to protest his incorruptibility? No one had accused him of such misdeeds. It must have been the request for a king that carried with it, for Samuel, the connotation of his own unworthiness. When a person is displaced it must be because he is unworthy, according to the unconscious pattern of thinking and feeling. Did this not happen with the sons of Eli and with Samuel's own sons? In fact, the very deeds from which he seeks vindication are the kind of which his sons were actually guilty. Might there have been some kind of identification with his sons and therefore with their feelings of guilt and of rejection? If so, he would need the reassurance of his people that they were not rejecting him and did not consider him unfit for office. But Samuel was evidently not content with the warm and immediate vindication offered by his people. He was not really ready to relinquish any part of his power. If he was not guilty of wrongdoing, then they must retain him as the leader. On this occasion when a king was anointed, he would show the people who the real source of power still was — himself. As is customary in biblical narrative, the marvelous goodness of God is rehearsed before the people at crucial moments of their history, and all that He did for them in the past is recounted. This Samuel now did, thus identifying himself once more with the power of God. He reinforced his position as representative of the Lord by an impressive demonstration of his might. Samuel called upon God to send thunder and rain in the midst of the harvest season, when rain is unusual. This was to be a sign from heaven of God's disapproval because the people had asked for a king. The thunder and rain came, and "all the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel." Then Samuel became magnanimous and reassured them, saying that he would not cease to pray to the Lord for them. Thus he made clear that he was retaining power as their spiritual leader, both over them and over their king.

The conflict with Saul that came later is thus clearly foreshadowed. It seemed almost certain from the start, judging by Samuel's attitude. He seemed to be waiting

only for the first false move on Saul's part so that he could demonstrate to the people and to the king how wicked they had been in displacing him. Saul's doom was pronounced even at the time of his anointment.

After a period of only two years came the inevitable split between Samuel and Saul. It occurred when Saul intruded into an area which Samuel considered his own — the religious leadership. Saul aroused Samuel's displeasure on two occasions. Some biblical commentators believe that the two episodes come from different sources and that just one instance of the king's disobedience to the prophet was involved. However, we will follow the biblical account as it does not seem to lack psychological validity.

In the first instance, Saul was waiting for Samuel to come and perform the sacrifice before his army was to go into action against the enemy. He waited the seven days requested by Samuel but the prophet did not appear. The impatient Saul, seeing that his army was drifting away from him and the opportune moment to go into action was waning, decided to perform the sacrifice himself. No sooner had he completed this act than Samuel arrived. The king was severely rebuked and told that his kingdom would be taken from him. On the second occasion, Saul's disobedience is of an even more serious nature. Samuel instructs Saul to fight the Amalekites, most hated foes of Israel, and to lay the whole city waste as a sacrifice to God. He was to spare nobody, including women, children, and animals. This form of the utter annihilation of a city as a symbol of religious devotion and sacrifice was a primitive custom among the people of those days. Samuel utilized this practice in his instruction to Saul. Was it his hope, perhaps, that Saul would again disobey and give him further cause for the rejection which was already present in Samuel's heart? Or was this to be another test of Saul's attitude to him? At any rate, Saul does disobey once more. He and his soldiers spared Agag, the king of the Amalekites, and also the best of the animals. Then, we are told, the word of the Lord came to Samuel saying that God was sorry He had chosen

Saul to be king because of the latter's disobedience. "And it grieved Samuel; and he cried unto the Lord all night," the Bible goes on to say. Samuel, therefore, did show signs of conflict about Saul. His rejection of the young man he had himself anointed had its element of pain for Samuel. Perhaps this was a narcissistic hurt, for he had erred in his estimate of Saul, thinking that the king would be completely subservient to his will. Perhaps it was also a disappointment in his own projected ego-ideal which Saul may have represented.

The scene in which Samuel rejects Saul is a dramatic one. The two men are a short distance from the camp. Samuel sharply reprimands Saul and tells him that God had rejected him as king. Saul pleads with Samuel to return with him and perform the sacrifice so that the king may save face. Samuel does so, but after the service demands that Agag be brought before him. In the sight of all the soldiers Samuel himself hews Agag to death with his sword. We are told that after this Samuel returned to Ramah and mourned for Saul. He never beheld the king again.

Why should Samuel have mourned for Saul? Actually, the latter retained his position as king of Israel. It was only in his relationship with Samuel that he fell from grace. Samuel's mourning indicates a deeply personal involvement and reveals his ambivalent attitudes toward Saul, based, probably, on his identification with the lost object.

(19)

Samuel, however, aroused himself from his mourning at the behest of God and went to Bethlehem, where he secretly anointed David, son of Jesse, as the second king of Israel. The manner in which Samuel selects David, youngest of Jesse's eight sons, also indicates the prophet's love of the dramatic and of his own sense of power. As related in the well-known story, Jesse causes his first seven sons to pass before Samuel but he turns them all down, one by one. Then he asks Jesse if he has any other children. The father replies that there is only the youngest and he is tending the sheep. Samuel asks that David be brought

before him and anoints this youth, again "the least in his father's house."

Like Saul, David was of striking physical beauty and strength, "ruddy and withal of beautiful eyes, and goodly to look upon." Once more, the same process, seemingly hypnotic in nature, occurs, for when Samuel anointed the youth, "the spirit of God came mightily upon David from that day forward."

Samuel evidently remained on good terms with David for the rest of the former's life, although the two seemed to have little further contact with each other. Saul remained in his kingly position and David was the Lord's anointed only in his secret pact with Samuel, awaiting some time in the future when the prophetic words of the priest would come true. There was therefore little opportunity for David as the actual leader to come into competition or conflict with Samuel. The latter died while David was still an outlaw, hiding from the wrath of Saul, whom he had offended by his own brilliant achievements in war.

Samuel's death is recorded with a brevity which seems rather anticlimactic. The Bible says, "And Samuel died; and all Israel gathered themselves together and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah." The next sentence resumes the story of David's activities, which had been thus briefly interrupted.

However, the element of the dramatic is not omitted from the figure of Samuel even after his death. Perhaps it is in harmony with his life story that the realistic factors regarding him should take second place to the mysterious or hypnotic influence he seemed to have exercised upon men. We hear of Samuel again in connection with the event leading to Saul's tragic death. It was the eve of a great battle which Saul and his army were to fight against their old foes, the Philistines. The situation looked bad for the Hebrews, who had pitched their tents on the slope of Mt. Gilboa, with their foes on the plain before them. When Saul saw the great forces of the enemy, he was afraid and tried to get some reassuring word of comfort from God. But God

did not reveal Himself to the desolate king in any of the accustomed ways, either in dreams or by the prophets, or by the Urim, a method of casting lots. In despair, Saul resorted to a procedure that he himself had banned from his kingdom. He had outlawed the practice of those who professed to divine the future by summoning ghosts or familiar spirits. In his desperation Saul now inquired if there was such a person in the vicinity and was told about the woman of Endor. With two companions, the king in disguise came to her at night and persuaded her to bring up Samuel. In the dramatic scene that follows, Samuel is ostensibly summoned from the dead and speaks with Saul through the mediumship of the woman. The prophet rebukes Saul for "disquieting" him in this fashion. He reminds the king that God has rejected him and foretells the defeat of the Israelites on the morrow and the death of Saul and his sons in the battle. Saul falls to the ground in a dead faint.

Samuel's prophecy comes true and Saul and his sons die on Mt. Gilboa the next day. Thus even after his death, Samuel retains a mysterious power over Saul. His prophecy may have served as a posthypnotic suggestion. The man who had once given Saul a "changed heart" took away this heart and abandoned the puppet king he had created.

In summary, let us see what the elements in Samuel's upbringing were that prepared him so successfully for his role. From earliest days he was "set apart" for a special task which he himself whole-heartedly accepted. There was therefore an unusual degree of harmony between his ego and his ego-ideal. What he wanted to be and what he was able to achieve were in close relationship to each other for the most part. When this failed to be true, Samuel seemed to respond as to a traumatic rejection on an intrapsychic level, almost as if his ego-ideal had rejected his ego, thus bringing about a depression. (20)

The fact that Samuel did not have the normal experience of growing up within a family circle probably helped to develop him as a leader. Freud points out that the absence of close libidinal ties strengthens the capacity for group

ties. It is true that Samuel must have experienced Eli's sons as sibling rivals, but they could have been competitors for the father's love only. The Oedipal feelings for a mother-figure could not have had much opportunity for expression and therefore must have provided additional energy for aim-inhibited goals. His apparent tendency for severe sexual repression confirms this view. Freud comments that "in the great artificial groups, the church and the army, there is no room for woman as a sexual object." (21) The trauma of abandonment by his parents may have helped to strengthen through reaction formation his feelings of being more valued rather than rejected. He had been offered by the mother as a gift to the Father, to Whom he may have turned with increased longing which found expression in the development of his ego-ideal. Freud says that "the ego-ideal is the substitute of a longing for a father . . . it contains the germ from which all the religions have developed." (22)

The concept of God was synonymous with the religious and moral ideals of Israel. Through his identification with God, therefore, Samuel also became identified with his people. He was the instrument through which they heard "the word of the Lord". We know that the superego is derived largely from auditory impressions. He who receives the words of God and conveys them to the group becomes the living symbol of the social superego.

Samuel's influence both over individuals and the group seemed to have a hypnotic character. This probably stemmed from his own firm conviction that he spoke the word of God and also from his narcissism, a quality which tends to have a fascinating effect upon followers.

As an intermediary between God and Israel, Samuel must have felt a special responsibility for his people in addition to the bond of common ideals which they shared. His sense of relatedness to them must also have been strengthened by his function as a circuit priest. He performed the ritual of the sacrifice in a community setting and joined the group in the communal meal that followed. Through this role, his position as a leader was continually renewed,

for he served as the good father who becomes united with his children in the common worship of an idealized Father. The repeated acts of sacrifice may also have helped Samuel to express his own feelings of aggression and at the same time to atone for them. (23)

Samuel's capacity and opportunity for leadership enabled him to utilize constructively a great deal of narcissistic and homosexual libido and therefore helped him to function without undue neurotic consequences most of the time.

With the exception of the twenty years for which we have no record, Samuel evidently maintained the acknowledged prestige and esteem as the chief religious leader of Israel during his lifetime. Since the people of Israel proved themselves quite able to reject a leader whom they regarded as unworthy, the position which Samuel continued to hold among them was a sure sign that he was able to serve them genuinely as an effective moral force.

230 Riverside Drive
New York 25, N.Y.

REFERENCES

1. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, *Samuel*, Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1918
2. Kent, Charles Foster, *Biblical Geography and History*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926, p. 141
3. Flescher, Joachim, *Mental Health and the Prevention of Neurosis*, Liveright Pub. Corp. New York, 1951, p. 225
4. Wellisch, Eric, *Isaac and Oedipus*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1954
5. Rank, Otto, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero*, Robert Brunner, New York, 1952
6. Freud, Sigmund, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, Liveright Pub. Corp., New York, 1949, p. 113
7. Freud, Sigmund, *On Narcissism*, Collected Papers, Vol. 4, Hogarth Press, London, 1950, p. 57

8. Freud, Sigmund, **The Predisposition to Obsessional Neurosis**, Collected Papers, Vol. 2, Hogarth Press, London, 1950, p. 131
9. Ibid. No. 6 (above) p. 70
10. Stewart, D. A. **The Psychogenesis of Empathy**, *Psa. Rev.* Vol. 41, 1954
11. Freud, Sigmund, **The Ego and the Id**, Hogarth Press, London, 1950, p. 52
12. Arlow, Jacob, **The Consecration of the Prophet**, *Psa. Quart.*, Vol. 20, 1951
13. Freud, Sigmund, **Dreams and Telepathy**, Ibid, No. 7. (above) p. 408
14. Ibid. No. 6 (above) p. 69
15. Ibid. No. 1 (above)
16. Hoenig and Rosenbert, **A Guide to the Prophets**, Bloch Pub. Co., New York, 1941, p. 28
17. Feldman, A. Bronson, **Mother-Country and Fatherland**, *Psychoanalysis*, N.P.A.P. Vol. 3, No. 2, 1955
18. Freud, Sigmund, **Certain Neurotic Mechanisms in Jealousy, Paranoia, and Homosexuality**, Ibid, No. 8 (above), p. 242
19. Freud, Sigmund **Mourning and Melancholia**, Ibid. No. 7 (above), p. 152
20. Greenacre, Phyllis, **Affective Disorders**, International Univ. Press, New York, 1953, p. 26
21. Ibid. No. 6 (above) p. 122
22. Ibid. No. 11 (above) p. 49
23. Freud, Sigmund, **Totem and Taboo**, Norton & Co., New York, 1950

The Family

— A Dream Analysis —

by

Raymond Van Zuyle

Some time ago I had a moving and painful dream, which seemed to me exceptional both in form and content. It occurred during the early part of my own analysis, at a time when the analyst had gone on a vacation. I therefore undertook its analysis myself, and the resultant insight proved a crucial step forward in my work, for the dream was one of those which reflects to the depths the entire unconscious constellation. The study of such dreams is always illuminating, particularly when made by the dreamer himself; and therefore in what follows, I shall report the analysis in its original form, which, as it turned out, required no additions or revisions. The dream, to which I have given the name "The Family", was as follows:

I am being shown the courts of the law. I am anxious to go on to the court of classic crimes of horror, medieval murders, but the Judge says: "Is not this one bad enough? It pertains to loss of property and arsenic." And I realize, there may be interesting deaths over property also.

Then I am being shown one of the cases, a photograph of a huge old family, with hundreds of children living on a great and ancient estate. I think how wonderful it is to be of such a family and meet one's cousins over the face of the earth.

Now I am actually looking at this great family. But they have been criminally dispossessed of their broad estate. They are living in a vast series of underground cavelike construction projects in the slum area, with walls of cement. I feel very sorry for them

Others do also, apparently. Photographers come to record their place and plight, bringing, to my amusement, the

"standard" bearded old derelict, and the "standard" little waif, whose pictures are familiar, for they are from Hollywood, and always hire themselves out for such occasions.

Now a new blow strikes the family. Enormous construction machines enter the smooth cement caverns, to tear up and destroy them, to make them into something else. I feel especially sorry for the children. The once high family must flee to the streets.

But one young lady, a proud daughter of the family, stands by as the stream of engines and apparatus pours in, imploring the men to desist, crying tragically, "No, no, no." But there are no men, only an endless series of great machines, and a line of immense hooks on a high overhead moving belt, swinging up and down as they advance. One catches her from behind as she pleads, transfixing her body, its huge curved point stabbing into her vagina, and carries her off backwards, up and down into the air. She screams frightfully again and again. Later on, the body is still, on the hook. Still later, in freezing horror, I glimpse it rising and falling in the far distant gloom of dim cement halls and chambers of curious slanting angles; but now the body is coming apart in a strange and gruesome way, in strands, like the taffy on a giant taffy pulling machine. Then all I can see is a vague intricate motion in the remote gloom.

This tragic and mercilous dream I will seek to understand by the classical analytical technique of free association to the individual components, thus revealing the underlying feelings which determine the dream images, and afterwards organizing them into a coherent expression of the unconscious.

No one must feel surprise at what is revealed in the course of the discussion, for the dream is clearly that of a person with severe unconscious conflicts, at least at the time of the dream. During my adolescence I combined in my person the character traits of an extreme "intellectual" and a "juvenile delinquent", and much of this appears in the dream associations, as well as material still more difficult to discuss. It is a long and dark journey which lies ahead into the unconscious foundations of this dream. Nevertheless

it seems to me that such analyses are worthwhile, particularly if they do not halt when deeper, more painful material is reached, but proceed unhesitatingly into the farthest depths. We cannot but profit from the purest personal honesty in these matters, and thence I will without further discussion commence the work of unravelling the dream.

1. *I am being shown the courts of the law.*

This sentence has a curiously formal quality which I find pleasant. It reminds me strongly of Kafka's book "The Trial" (as well as his short story, "The Penal Colony") which made a deep impression on me. It is even possible that I borrowed the phrase "The courts of the law" from this book. Another thing which strikes me is the inactivity on my part which is implied. I am not admitting in this dream my responsibility for the action in it, but am passively being shown these courts. While about eighteen or nineteen years of age, a few months before having the dream, I worked for a civil service Job with the County, in which part of my task was to go into large courtrooms bringing and taking mail, and I was impressed with the stately atmosphere, the lofty formalization of procedure, an atmosphere which certainly emanates from the initial sentence of this dream. What is more, my own father was, recently before the dream, in court himself, because of an invention he was working on that was claimed fraudulent. But I too have been in court. When about fifteen or sixteen I used to engage in juvenile delinquency, mostly stealing, and was once or twice apprehended for it. But now my own attitude towards "The Law" is revealed. I have always been of an unconventional bend, and in my adolescence, which was very maladjusted, I constantly transgressed "The Law", or family, morality, school, and society. My attitude towards the law was hardly even one of defiance, rather did I completely ignore its existence while pursuing my own way. But this is by no means the whole story of my behaviour toward law. I have always had in certain fields a very strong "inner law". Thus, at one time I was possessed with mathematics, and used to study it with a fierce energy to the

exclusion of everything else, mastering post graduate college courses while still in high school, more or less completely on my own out of books, pretty well to the exclusion of any social life. Later, I did nearly the same thing with music. I did not feel these rigorous and concentrated activities as compulsions, but as desires; that is, they were not like a force outside, but part of my personality. And they led to remarkable external conflicts: at one time, even, I would steal advanced mathematical texts that I could not obtain in other ways, showing my complete disrespect for "outer law". Yet the field which I chose, and thought to make my profession, was the very incarnation of law, the most exact and perfect set of laws ever devised by man; it was in this very attribute that I took the highest pleasure, and eventually made symbolic logic my chosen subfield of mathematics, for in it, rigour became altogether perfect and nothing was left to unorganized intuition, the whole of mathematics being deduced with a cold and magnificent precision from the foundations of pure logic. But this mathematical activity quite disrupted my school career, as I neglected my other studies for mathematics, and indeed, though I had always loved to read and know, never liked school or did well in it. Later on, my interest in music took the same bend, Bach, Beethoven and Mozart being my favorite composers almost to the exclusion of everyone else, because of their high degree of organization. But my reasons for all this formalization were not simply to eliminate emotion. On the contrary, I attributed and gained the highest emotional pleasure from the "perfection" of these works. The main drift indicated by my intellectual activity was certainly one of compulsion neurosis of a special kind, where the superego is felt as part of the ego, and thus never appearing in a "forbidding" role, but the manner in which I ignored the demands of reality, and a certain positive taste for the bizarre, suggests an underlying schizophrenic tendency. In my own family, my mother remained dominant through a succession of three husbands, and from about eight years on, she and I con-

stantly quarrelled, as she wished to control my actions and I denied any external control.

2. *I am anxious to go on to the court of classic crimes of horror, medieval murders—*

Here in the dream I reveal an interest in murder and horror. This interest certainly exists also in real life. When very young I used constantly to read "horror stories" and attend "horror movies". I had an intense love of the macabre, the bizarre, the unusual generally. This was so strong as to create a severe imbalance in the way of neglecting "ordinary" things; I was always doing and talking about *strange* things. But it interests me that the reference is to *classic* crimes, to *medieval murders*. Why this implication of the remote past? When I think of "medieval murders" I have a vision of smoky dungeons with rusty instruments of torture hanging on the walls. But to my feelings this emphasis on the past certainly means something in terms of my own past. I know that Law, in the sense of compulsion and order, and sadism and murderous ideas also, have their common origin in the anal stage, which in psychoanalysis is both classic and classified. Why do I have a fascination with "crimes of horror"? I was never an especially sadistic person, in fact I had a dread of fighting and an inclination to be warm-hearted. At times, I feared individuals but seldom had great rage at them, and then only momentarily. Yet at other times an astonishing streak of cruelty would appear in me in little ways. Once I drowned a gopher in an exceptionally gruesome way, and when small was fond of composing original tortures for insects. I would often feel a peculiar thrill on reading of injuries done to people, especially sexual, and when I fantasied sexual relations, often (but not always) imagined it as against the partner's will, or partly against their will despite enjoyment; and this applied to both heterosexual and homosexual relations, for a small percentage of the time I would imagine the latter also. Nevertheless, on the whole in practise I was less cruel than most boys; in fact, I had

a decided fear of rage, both other people's and my own. There must have been a strong unconscious undercurrent of sadisms and fears which were thus satisfied only indirectly, by my more intellectualized interest in horrible things. These forces manifest themselves in this part of the dream, but they are still kept at a distance, in the deep past.

3. *But the Judge says: "Is not this one bad enough? It pertains to loss of property and arsenic."*

"The Judge" is a very imposing figure here. I have always had an intense admiration for certain similar figures who were great system builders, such as Newton and Einstein, Bach and Beethoven, Jesus and Freud. After becoming interested in the system itself, I am taken up with its creator, study the life of the individual, and conceive a tremendous almost worshipful regard for him. One would think that this was a "projection of the father image", but it is not, for I have had no "strong father". Perhaps it is this very fact which makes me seek for one, for the security of some unassailable system of ideas or feelings whose creator I identify with. The Judge does not think it necessary for me to occupy myself with gruesome murders. His court has that which will satisfy me, *loss of property and arsenic*. In the term arsenic, however, he reveals that there is really murder in his court also, and I am further reminded of my mother frequently making me eat things I did not like, as well as many "food phobias" that I used to have, and the idea that engaging in certain "low" activities such as football would "degrade" me. But the phrase "loss of property" is still more interesting. I have strong feelings about property, at once acquisitive and communistic. I have a certain liking for material property, but probably less than normal; what I have I freely share with my friends. Intellectual property is a different matter. Here I am intensely and excessively acquisitive, and although I love to share and teach this kind of property also, it has the quality that one loses none of it by sharing it. Yet my intense curiosity in this line has peculiar reflections in the world of

material property, because science and art are conveyed by material things, such as books and records, and these I used to steal. Nor was this all. In still earlier childhood, I stole things from stores, had a thieving love of electrical machinery, and still earlier, stole from my mother's purse and often used to "go through her things", to her great fury. But it was not the desire merely to steal which led me to do so; on the contrary, the actual act worried me, although it was thrilling also. But mainly it was the pure love of property, like a packrat. I used to have all kinds of little storehouses of things, like a true anal character, and it mattered little to me whether I secured them by fair means or foul. This reminds us of the fact that the first property is one's own feces, which were once a pleasurable part of one's body, and this feeling forms the prototype of the property concept. Once again we have been led to the anal stage, which is the common origin of law, its opposite, cruelty, and its subject, property. The idea of poisoning involved in the reference to arsenic takes on a new significance in this connection, since intake trouble precedes elimination trouble. It is probable that my minor mania for property, as well as my "feeling for law" and my retaliatory sadism came from a toilet training which was too early and too strict, so that I could never really feel that I had "control over my property" and was always trying to express such feelings.

4. *And I realize, there may be interesting deaths over property also.*

This rather chilling statement seems to reveal that my interest is fundamentally neither in law nor in property, except as they are related to death. Of course, the meaning of death here is in reference to "crimes of horror, medieval murders", that is to unconscious feelings of sadistic aggression which may be directed either at oneself or others. It seems as though I am saying that these aggressive feelings, this unconscious cruelty need not be satisfied directly, but can also be discharged by means of feelings pertaining to

property. But how is this? The fact is, I used to be quite cruel to myself as regards the acquisition of intellectual "property". True, I enjoyed it, it satisfied an intense curiosity, but at the same time I drove myself to study and nothing else. And I inflicted this pursuit on other people, talking about nothing but my driving interest, careless of whatever inconveniences it caused others, even to the point of stealing. It is interesting that it is the Judge who makes this suggestion to me that I can discharge aggressions in the more constructive way. All my life there have been figures (of both sexes) whom I intensely admired, because of their quality of understanding, mastery, consistency, or similar elements; some were teachers at the schools I attended, others were creative geniuses whose works I came in contact with. As a result of such influences I have become a "system builder", always striving to identify with some idea or structure, and in particular, the structure of science, which I have always felt the strongest attraction towards, as it gave the clearest "World-View", the most comprehensive and powerful one, in the light of which everything could be surveyed, and within which security could be found.

Thus it seems that the first paragraph of the dream expresses unconscious feelings revolving about the anal stage and compulsion neurosis. Unconscious sadistic feeling symbolically discharged in the wish fulfillment of observing crimes, murders, horror. But, after my usual mode of behaviour, these are expressed purely as an interest in seeing these things, rather than an actual doing of them. What is more, they occur within the framework of the courts of the law, giving expression to my way of satisfying feelings indirectly (and partly suppressing them) through formalized abstractions, wishing to "know" and "judge" a thing rather than really feel it. The knowing and judging of the feeling are as close as I permit myself to come to its psychic reality. My property complex also is brought in, and indeed "knowing" is the same thing as "having", just as "judging" implies "knowing". The whole "formalized"

character of this initial paragraph is characteristic of compulsion neurosis with its holding of feelings at a distance. I permit myself only to be "interested". The Judge is the incarnation of the compulsive ideal which is also suggested by my liking of the phrase "courts of the law". At the same time he is the "strong father" which I strive to be like and need because I never had one. He is able to tell me that I can satisfy my aggressions in less direct ways, concerned with property.

5. *Then I am shown one of the cases, a photograph of a huge old family, with hundreds of children, living on a great and ancient estate.*

This imagined situation is the antithesis of my own family. I have not many relatives, and those few are frequently in conflict with one another. Nor did I have any brothers or sisters, and in my earlier childhood we constantly moved from place to place, and, as I mentioned previously, my mother had married three different husbands before I was twelve. The picture conjured up in the dream has a stability and breadth emotionally of the kind I have sought in more intellectual or philosophical realms. Further, I have a love of great estates and parklands which the dream utilized. Symbolically, *the family of the dream is the great family of my feelings*. The age of the estate symbolizes the origin in the far past of these feelings, and their historical importance. I have sometimes felt my friends to be such a family, and also a particular group which I identify with, for instance the group of mathematicians. In this case I used to be very familiar with the lives and work of great mathematicians of the past and present.

6. *I think how wonderful it is to be of such a family, and meet one's cousins over the face of the earth.*

This of course ties in with the remarks about the previous sentence, which here applies equally well. 6 is the explicit statement of what is implied in 5. Particularly brought out is my pleasure in youth and companionship,

which has part of its origin in certain homosexual feelings. These in turn are due to the fact that I am "looking for male feelings", since I never had a strong father and my mother was the really "masculine" member of the family, leaving a certain confusion in my feelings about masculinity and femininity. This is certainly one of the reasons why I enjoy very close friendships with people of my own age and sex. A further element involved is a fear of woman brought about by too active and dominating a mother, who herself wanted to be the "masculine" one.

In this paragraph, the emphasis has shifted from the compulsive orientation of the preceding one. More positive feelings of a longing sort are expressed, feelings closer to the Oedipus situation, in their emphasis on family and warm human relations. But an ominous shadow hangs over these beautiful but lost emotions. They consist of a "case" of "death over loss of property". Why have they died, and because of what loss? Let us go on to the next paragraph and find out what is the relation between the constellations of the first and second paragraphs, my more human feelings versus the rigorous forces which sometimes rule me.

7. *Now I am actually looking at this great family.*

Before I was merely looking at a photograph of it, a device which served both the purpose of "keeping the feelings at a distance", so that they would not be too poignant (revealing too their actual remoteness from my conscious life) and also preserved the developmental continuity of the dream. But I no longer can or wish to hold off these intense feelings. I am coming closer, actually looking at them. This mechanism of a picture or photograph turning into the real things is frequently employed in dreams.

8. *But they have been criminally dispossessed of their broad estate.*

This has a strong meaning to me, for in spite of my own "criminal" activities I am passionately opposed to "injustice", especially when the injustice is to myself. In this case it is to myself. My family has been dispossessed of its

estate, my feelings have been dispossessed of their expression, save through the roundabout and murderous ways envisioned in the first paragraph. The word "dispossessed" suggests pseudo-legal operations. It is as though the law itself, the factors of the first paragraph, had something to do with this "crime of horror", this "loss of property". And this brings us back to the deeper anal meaning of loss of property in which parental law indeed robs us of our first and deepest property and self-responsibility feelings, making it difficult to go on into higher feelings involving more of an object relation with other human beings. What then happens to the family?

9. *They are living in a vast series of underground cave-like construction projects in the slum area, with walls of cement.*

This brings many memories to my mind. When a boy, I used to prowl around a great deal in the storm drains of my city, vast square cement tunnels branching about underneath the ground, which could be entered only by crawling into a sewer in the curbing. I always had a fondness for secret dens and other places of refuge, but the storm drains were my favorite. There were even times when I lived in them for a while, as I ran away from home two or three times, because my second stepfather used to beat me for my anti-social activities (he was not cruel, but a simple man of stern honesty). Indeed, I even at times kept stolen goods in particularly deep corners of these lower regions. Once I smuggled many bricks and much cement down into a special hole I had found all of my own which could be entered only by crawling through a long, small, and muddy tunnel, and there built a little room as a secret retreat, to which I could come when there was no other place, or the conflicts at home were too severe. This love of caves and dark mysterious places has always been with me; such places inspire me with the desire to explore and be master of them, just as I now explore the hidden recesses of my dream. Apparently, the family, the family of my feelings, is repeating

my old adventure and has been driven forth from its true home into the caves and sewers of the slum area, just as I once felt driven forth myself. But there is a deep significance in these underground passages. We have seen how the family was driven back to the anal stage by being robbed of its property, but now this significance is underlined in a deeper way by the presence of caverns, whose true significance is in reference to the caverns, "sewers", and "underground passages" of the human body. This is a frequently employed dream symbol. It indicates a desire to investigate these dark regions of the body, and also the connection with ground (underground) and dirt (especially with storm drains and sewers, construction areas) brings out and expresses their anal orientation, as does "slum area"; in fact, a slum area is not only a *dirty* place of living, but a place where *poor* people live, people, that is, who have little property or money.

10. *I feel very sorry for them.*

Sorrow is just what I used to feel a great deal of, in connection with the conflicts I had with my family which at times made it necessary even for me to run away. I experienced an intense, painful, and frustrating sorrow. Now in the dream I am feeling sorrow on a larger scale, for my feelings in general because of what has happened to them. It is the grief of the little child in me, quite unsophisticated.

In this third paragraph then, the relation between the first and second paragraphs is revealed. In fact this also happens in the manifest content of the dream, which therefore shows the highest degree of symbolic organization. But in the deeper feelings underlying the dream, the same thing occurs. In the first scene the compulsion neurosis is revealed, with its triple foundations of law, cruelty, and property. In the second scene my true feelings are given, which have a more simple and sincere character than those of the former scene. But in the third scene, the fate which these more human feelings have undergone at the hands of the

compulsion neurosis is dramatically recreated in symbolic form.

11. *Others do also, apparently. Photographers come to record their place and plight—*

This shows that I am by no means a complete introvert! I have always had a great desire to see, understand, and discuss. Here I am actually having the situation photographed and published, just as I now actually record it. My inclination is to be quite open about my activities and feelings, and when a problem comes up, to talk it over with other people also. In this dream sentence it is almost as if I am summoning help, (which may mean, among other things, the scopophilic forces of the intellect, which rush to the scene with analyses).

12. —*Bringing, to my amusement, the "standard" little waif, whose pictures are familiar, for they are from Hollywood, and always hire themselves out for such occasions.*

This is an odd and subtle twist which reminds me of many previous episodes frequent in my dreams, where some especially peculiar and enigmatic event occurs, generally in conversational form with a tone of artificiality. There is an implication of deceit or insincerity in this bizarre episode. It shows my "fake" feelings, the front I sometimes put up, either of mature age or childish immaturity, but both being false and actually humorous to me, and both being devices to gain sympathy, at least in the cases of "derelict" and "waif". These, as the dream sentence makes clear, are quite different and in a class apart from the more sincere feelings of the family. They are only for other people's benefit, and indeed originate in "Hollywood", the symbol to me of all that is artificial, insincere, and superficial. They are mobilized deliberately and repetitively for special occasions; I may masquerade as the wise one whom uncomprehending society has driven into dereliction, or the innocent young one who knows nothing of all these things he is supposed to have done. Of course, I use these attitudes on

myself as well as on others, but I am sufficiently conscious of them to feel humorous about it. At the same time I may be mocking the false or unhelpful sympathy that others sometimes extend to me, since the photographers *bring* these fakes to "sympathize with the family. Perhaps it is such people that I particularly use my own false front on.

This fourth scene then is the symbolic expression of the relation of my conflict to other people. Sometimes I have people come to "record" and discuss it, but at other times I bring out certain "false feelings" or fronts for use on others, and even on myself in relation to others. At any rate, there is a definite social interaction.

13. *Now a new blow strikes the family. Enormous construction machines enter the smooth cement caverns, to tear up and destroy them, to make them into something else.*

This first sentence is characteristic of my adolescence, in which troubles often came more than one at a time. But what is this machine catastrophe which falls upon the family? It reminds me vividly of the way my compulsive activities used to upset my normal life. When I see the phrase: "... and make them into something else", I think of the way my viewpoint has changed over the years, how my center of interest has shifted from mathematics to psychology, and many other profound alterations. Certainly the force of my more compulsive activities, the things I am determined to do regardless of my own or society's regrets, is here expressed in these terrible machines which brutally override the human feelings, even in their murky stronghold of anal refuge. The sexualized content of the compulsion is revealed by the well-known mechanistic symbolism of the genital apparatus, which is "raping" the more tender feelings. At the same time, the machinery going through the caves symbolizes on a deeper level the act of defecation, which in me is also of a brief and forceful character. Thus, I am not adequately sublimated; that is to say, my compulsions do not operate in a "well adjusted" way nor do the deeper Oedipus feelings find adequate expression in them.

Instead, sexual feelings find an anal-sadistic outlet compulsively tormenting both to me and to others. I remember how rigorously I used to impose my compulsions on a boy whom I felt in love with in adolescence (and even used to imagine homosexual relations with, sometimes anally, thus expressing the wish-fulfillment of the apparatus going through the caves) and tried to force him almost into an image of myself, which created quite a general upset in our environment. Here, quite transparently, the underlying tender feelings could only be expressed with the aid of compulsive mechanisms, just as now, I attempt to express the tender feelings beneath the dream by a compulsive-intellectual analysis of it.

14. *I feel especially sorry for the children.*

Naturally, I am most sorry for the "child in myself", my young feelings which are trampled on by the compulsion. This sorrow appeared before in the third scene of the dream for similar reasons. At the same time the sorrow is for the too strict toilet training I underwent, which replaced the natural feelings of the child I once was with compulsions. And by identification, I feel sorry, too, for the victims of those compulsions.

15. *The once-high family must flee to the streets.*

At one time, I remember, I was being chased through the darkness of the storm drains by policemen and actually did have to flee to the streets! To "flee to the streets" is to me a symbol of the last resort, when every stronghold and place of security has failed. My feelings are not properly operating through the compulsive pattern. Perhaps the underlying love is too profound and intense ever to submit to compulsions, which must accordingly be redoubled to fend it off. There is a conflict between them, and the inner turmoil is too strong for the pattern to control. The compulsive activities which are the only ones through which my feelings find sufficient expression create internal and external conflicts too great to master. As a matter of fact, I used to "take a walk" when under emotional stress.

This sixth scene then designates the "return of the repressed". The neurosis cannot stabilize, the powers are too immense on either side, and unmastered sexual-aggressive excitations destroy all in their path.

16. *But one young lady, a proud daughter of the family, stands by as the stream of engines and apparatus pours in, imploring the men to desist, crying tragically, "No, no, no."*

This singular and powerful image is one of the most striking in the dream. What is the meaning of the "proud daughter of the family" and her tragic resistance to catastrophe? She is one of the family of my feelings, and of course the symbol of my female feelings or feelings about women. In her youth she is like my mother (who is so remarkably well preserved that when I was nineteen and she was forty-two, she was often mistaken for my sister and almost never estimated at over twenty-eight). Similarly for her pride, for my mother has a certain self-reliant pride which is clearly reminiscent of the figure in the dream. These resemblances are natural since one's feelings about women, one's female feelings, are learned from and first formed by the mother. But what terrible event is taking place in this vivid dream scene? We have spoken before of the phallic significance of engines and apparatus. The lady is *resisting* them, "imploring the men to desist", crying "No, no, no". I am reminded that when in adolescence I first had intercourse, the lady involved, in the intensity of her feelings, used just these words to me. "Imploring the men to desist" certainly drives home this idea, as does the phrase "the stream of engines and apparatus pours in". Thus we have here a sadistic phantasy of intercourse. But I am very carefully avoiding responsibility for it. Not only is everything deeply symbolized, but I am keeping myself completely out of the picture as a mere observer, expressing the action of my feelings through the medium of machinery, which also has a compulsion-neurotic significance. What is more, she is obviously protecting the young feelings, saying

"save the children", as the compulsive sexuality and anxiety mechanisms annihilate them and draw near.

17. *But there are no men, only an endless series of great machines, and a line of immense hooks on a high overhead moving belt, swinging up and down as they advance.*

Once again the symbolism of machinery is involved. Elaborate apparatus, complicated mechanisms have always held a deep fascination for me. The image of the overhead belt of hooks was certainly suggested by the fact that at the time of the dream I worked in an aircraft plant, where there were just such overhead moving belts to carry burdens on, and sometimes actually moving up and down to release and receive their loads. But there is a sinister, almost frightening nuance, in the phrase: "But there are no men . . .". In answer to her plea, there is no response, nothing. The meaning is, the intercourse is on the level of the compulsion neurosis. There are no true male feelings to respond to. The sexual feelings can express themselves only through compulsive-sadistic channels. The intercourse itself is compulsive, actually done by machines instead of a man. The rhythmic phallic significance of the advancing swinging hooks is quite clear in this respect. I am reminded again of how in early masturbation fantasies I usually imagined intercourse against the woman's will, how in actual intercourse I could feel in a deep layer within me the impulse to "get a response", almost to hurt. Indeed, the fatal sentence, "But there are no men", at the same time reveals the source of my homosexual feelings, which are an attempt to get male feelings. The regression of masculinity to the compulsive level is clearly shown in this phase of the dream.

18. *One catches her from behind as she pleads, transfixing her body, its huge curved point stabbing into her vagina and carries her off backwards, up and down into the air.*

This is the schizophrenic climax of the dream. I use the term "schizophrenic" advisedly, as it is very dubious if an ordinary compulsion neurosis could permit a break-

through of the unconscious directly enough so that the sexual-sadistic could be directly expressed. If it did break through thus, the individual might well be awakened by the impact of the nightmare at this point, from sheer alarm of the censors. This scene of the dream brings a direct unconscious content into the world of reality, as is characteristic of the schizophrenic, who cannot reconcile the inner and outer worlds. The ordinary compulsion neurotic is seldom so ill-adjusted to reality as I was; nor, on the other hand, does he obtain so much real instinctual satisfaction through strange channels both abstract and concrete as I did. Thus I must diagnose myself as a compulsion neurotic with a tendency toward schizophrenic regression rather than a simple compulsion neurotic. This high point in the dream infallibly reminds me of Kafka's story, "The Penal Colony", in which a weird and intricate machine administered justice by writing the sentence again and again on the prisoner's back in a complex script with needles of acid until he died enlightened. I have always taken an intense pleasure in such ideas, and used to delight to startle people with this order of thoughts. On the other hand, my ability to get satisfaction from reality in unusual and forbidden ways, and my uncaring attitude about them, are further signs of the schizophrenic process which the compulsive feelings are subjected to. The power and immensity of the dream projections, the great hooks and the tense and tragic atmosphere show however that although these partly reveal a remoteness from "human nature's daily food", on the other hand they reveal a certain respect for my feelings, a realization of their importance and their relation to reality which usually prevents me from going too far, either in losing contact with reality or in too much repression (losing contact with my unconscious). Also, in spite of the schizophrenic expression, the actual content given here in the dream is compulsive-sadistic. The tender young feelings are snatched off backwards (that is, against their will and natural tendency) by the demonic compulsions. I still remember when I woke up the peculiar sexual excitement I felt on recalling

this part of the dream. There is another factor in this scene, a part more on the surface, which it would be well to consider. This is the remarkable degree of organization and the dramatic overwhelming character of the climax (which led some to think that I had altered or polished the dream in recording it). This is consonant with the fact that to some people my personality has a compelling, dramatic, or powerful quality. The force and organization which such a quality implies is vividly revealed in the dream, as also does its complete, almost epic character. It is the dream of a person who looks at everything from a unified point of view and organizes his experience into wholes with all their parts intensively related. The content of the dream is neurotic, but not the form.

19. *She screams frightfully again and again. Later on, the body is still, on the hook.*

This screaming partly of course satisfies sadistic feelings. At the same time, from another point of view, it expresses the agony my own female feelings undergo, as they are not allowed to express themselves in warmth toward women, but only in cruelty and torment. Also, my anxiety of such a thing happening to myself, expressed in inverted form, my fear that heterosexual feelings will result in castration ("there are no men") from the strong mother. Instead, I turn this fate back on the woman. But this word "instead" is only a concession to the logic of consciousness, for the woman who symbolizes my mother, on a deep level, like all dream images symbolizes my own feelings, in this case the female feelings which I learned from her, and accordingly to the unconscious, which perceives feelings and their objects in an organic unity, the destruction of the woman is at the same time the rape of my own femininity, my feelings of tenderness and acceptance, and this too is a wish-fulfillment, since it is the very repression of all these feelings (the repressions themselves carrying the active-constructive male feelings now regressed to the sadistic-restrictive level), their confinement to abstract-compulsive

channels, which makes them demand, in the endeavor for some expression, however distorted, an ever more violent satisfaction. This in turn is a result of my mother's own handling of her female feelings, which she hated and tried to destroy, unconsciously wanting to be male. The subsequent death of the woman is an ominous sign. It means more than the fulfilment of sadism and the relaxation after intercourse. It is the death of my female feelings, my proper ability to identify with women, and hence the death of my masculinity. It is certainly true that during most of my adolescence I avoided girls consistently (although not fanatically) and their presence was unconsciously disturbing. This again goes back to my mother who unconsciously wished to destroy my masculinity and that of her husbands, creating alarm in all of us ("you have a mind like a steel trap", said her second husband to her, a neat example of "displacement upwards". And have I inherited that mind?). The female feelings I should have learned from her "died" because she did not accept them herself.

20. *Still later, in freezing horror, I glimpse it rising and falling in the far distant gloom of dim cement halls and chambers of curious slanting angles: but now the body is coming apart in a strange and gruesome way, in strands, like the taffy on a giant taffy pulling machine.*

This retreat into the distance is partly a pushing away of feelings fast becoming too intense to be born. In fact, this is shown by the first reference to my own feelings which has directly appeared thus far in the dream, my "freezing horror". But there is a deeper and more amazing meaning in this descent of the body into the bowels of the cavern. It is a pictorial representation of the regression of murdered female feelings to the anal stage, back to the era of toilet training, as this is the highest mode through which in this case the sexual energies can really express themselves. The "curiously slanting angles" of the cavern refer to dim primeval perceptions of bodily cavities, perhaps even to the inner angles of a toilet, and also the convolutions of the storm

drains. The "rising and falling" shows the sexual activity still compulsively operating. The ghastly disintegration of the body parallels the disintegration which occurs in the living organism of warm young feelings when they can only be expressed through the forced tearing mechanisms of the compulsive level. They are actually subjected to a mechanical pulling, pushing, and dissecting which the inexorable function of the taffy puller well expresses.

21. *Then all I can see is a vague intricate motion in the remote gloom.*

This is the perfectly appropriate conclusion, which we seldom get in dream formation, as the dream usually is either cut off or glides into new material. Not only is the completion of the regression expressed, but the sinking of the entire drama back into the unconscious whence it came is beautifully symbolized. The great dream has run its course and stated its conclusion.

This dream to a unique degree concentrates on my neurosis. Everything else is ignored except the worst and deepest parts of the unconscious conflict, which receive an organized and darkly magnificent expression. The first scene symbolizes the general pattern of the compulsion neurosis, the male feelings expressing themselves in the regressive form of legalistic compulsions and sadism. The second scene shows the live Oedipus and female feelings underlying those anal repressions. The third scene reveals the relation between the two, in which the compulsion neurosis has been used to suppress the Oedipus feelings (which seem to revolve about femininity in a confused way). The fourth scene illustrates the relation of my neurosis to other people. The fifth scene pictures the further encroachments which the neurosis makes on my life and deeper feelings, being unable to preserve even a compulsive balance. The sixth and final scene is a revelation from the depths. The compulsive sadism is pictured, and its genetic roots also in terms of lack or regression of male feelings and confused and repressed female feelings, of a type so severe as to be subjected

to a schizophrenic process, the whole violent conflict undergoing partial repression again into the compulsion neurosis already described, closing the circle to the beginning of the dream. The sixth scene indeed gives us knowledge of the primary unconscious conflicts which made necessary the formation of an instable compulsion neurosis with schizophrenic trends. And the dream as a whole is the perfect expression and symbolic condensation of an involved neurosis in all its aspects.

The analysis of this dream was a difficult task. I had a distinct resistance to the interpretative labor, and was kept to it only by the desire to penetrate the secret of a dream with what were, to me, such dramatic qualities, qualities whose analysis promised a previously unattained insight. After the close of the work I had another dream, which in organization seemed even to surpass the first, and to express similar things on a higher plane, a dream with "anagogic" as well as psychoanalytical interpretations, also showing some of my internal changes since the first dream. In a way, it seemed to symbolize the analytic destruction of the compulsive edifice and the resultant journey toward new life. It seems appropriate to me to conclude this analysis by quoting this new dream. In a way, this is a method of "putting my feelings together again" after having taken them apart. Finally, it follows a natural law of analysis succeeded by a higher synthesis and makes a circle of the entire study. This new dream is called:

THE TOWER

I am the master of the tower of Babel. I proudly stand on the highest pavilion of the tower. Long rows of lower pavilions extend below me in gigantic steps, and leaning far over, I see beyond the edge of the lowest pavilion to the descending sides of the tower, plummeting down through limitless depths to the ground miles below. My strange

friend King has come to pay me a visit. He stands with me and admires the great panorama visible from our vantage point, the distant hills, mountains, and clouds far beneath us during the burning blue of the infinite sky.

I am telling him that I fear a palace conspiracy. There are not many that I can trust, and large numbers of my followers seem to be plotting a great revolution. King listens in silence. Then it is time for him to go. I accompany him down the elevators to the base of the tower. The ground floor is an immense sapphire dome so huge that its highest arch is beyond sight, and supported by innumerable slender and transparent pillars which soar into the invisible blue heights. We walk out the vaulted portals and down the broad steps to the ground.

Then to my terrible surprise and awe, King stops, turns around towards the tower which is the product of my genius, and raises his arms above his head. With this he delivers a frightful curse upon the tower. He curses it from its deepest foundations to its highest pavilions, he curses its every room and hall, he curses its makers and its followers, its past, its present, and its future. Following this, he warns me that the tower shall not remain in three days, and that never again will he behold it. He then walks off.

Very worried, I rush and run back into the tower and collect those of my followers whom I know I can trust . . . about fifteen men out of many hundreds. We hastily and secretly depart, journeying off toward the distant hills. On the third day, we turn around towards the gigantic column of the tower in the distance, and watch an incredible annihilation befall it. Great sheets and slabs of masonry begin crumbling from the sides and the highest levels. Strange spurts of fire appear in the far windows, and the whole structure shakes as in an earthquake. Then in terrible fountains of red and blue flames, with clouds of smoke and shattering marble, the tower in all its magnificent architecture pours to the ground and is driven into nothingness.

With a sad feeling I turn to my true followers. "At

least the traitors were destroyed along with it", I say, consolingly. "Now let us travel on to the new lands before us, and build again."

1643½ Shenandoah St.
Los Angeles 35, California



IN THIS ISSUE

The Neurotic Hero of Typee
Helen B. Petrullo

The Tragic Guilt of Prometheus
Helen Huckel

The Relation of Writers To Literary Criticism
Edmund Bergler, M.D.

On Bullfighting
Winslow Hunt

A Character Study of Samuel
Dorothy F. Zeligs

The Family — A Dream Analysis
Raymond Van Zuyle

Volume 12 will consist of four issues containing approximately 450 pages. Price of subscription \$5. All communications to be addressed to the Managing Editor.

GEORGE B. WILBUR, M.D. - SOUTH DENNIS, MASS.

